

Proceedings
OF THE
THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL
CONVENTION
OF THE
Association of
Colleges and Preparatory
Schools
in the Middle States and
Maryland

1921

HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY
NOVEMBER 25 and 26, 1921

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION
1922

NOTICE

Extra copies of the Proceedings of the Association may be secured without charge from the Secretary by any officer of a College or School holding membership in the Association.

A charge of twenty-five cents per copy is made to those not members of the Association.

The next Convention of the Association will be held at Tower Hill School, Wilmington, Del., on the Friday and Saturday following Thanksgiving, 1922.

Proceedings
OF THE
THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL
CONVENTION
OF THE
Association of
Colleges and Preparatory
Schools
in the Middle States and
Maryland

1921

HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY
NOVEMBER 25 and 26, 1921

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION
1922

CONTENTS

	PAGE.
Officers of the Association, 1921-22	4
Commissions under Auspices of the Association	5
<i>The Product of Our Schools and Colleges</i>	
1. What We Get	
<i>Dean John H. Latane</i>	7
2. What We Want	
<i>Professor Katherine J. Gallagher</i>	11
3. How Can We Improve the Product	
a. Vitalizing the Teaching	
<i>President Frederick C. Ferry</i>	23
b. Testing the Results	
<i>Dr. J. Cayce Morrison</i>	31
Temporary Committees	36
Report of the Treasurer	37
Report of the Auditing Committee	38
Report of the Executive Committee	38
Appointments	40
<i>The Standardization of Universities and Colleges</i>	
(Addresses by Members of a Committee from the Association of College Presidents of Pennsylvania)	
<i>Dr. Henry S. Drinker</i>	40
<i>Dean Albert G. Rau</i>	44
<i>President Ethelbert D. Warfield</i>	46
Report of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education	50
Discussion of Report	54
List of Approved Colleges	56
List of Members, 1921-22	59
List of Delegates	65

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1921-22

President

DR. WILLIAM M. IRVINE, Headmaster, Mercersburg Academy.

Honorary Vice Presidents

New York—DR. FRANK P. GRAVES, President, University of the State of N. Y., New York State Commissioner of Education.

New Jersey—DR. W. H. DEMAREST, President, Rutgers College.

Pennsylvania—MISS JESSIE E. ALLEN, Philadelphia High School for Girls.

Delaware—DR. WALTER HULLIHEN, President, Delaware College.

Maryland—DR. J. H. APPLE, President, Hood College, Frederick, Md.

Secretary

DR. GEORGE WM. McCLELLAND, University of Pennsylvania.

Treasurer

MR. STANLEY R. YARNALL, Germantown Friends' School.

Executive Committee

DR. FRANK AYDELOTTE, President, Swarthmore College.

MISS VALENTINE CHANDOR, Chandor School, New York City.

DR. JOHN HANEY, President, Central High School, Philadelphia.

DR. W. W. GUTH, President, Goucher College.

COMMISSIONS UNDER AUSPICES OF THE ASSOCIATION

COMMISSION ON HIGHER INSTITUTIONS:

Terms expiring in 1922: Professor ADAM LEROY JONES, Columbia University, Chairman; Mr. WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy; Professor LUTHER P. EISENHARDT, Princeton University; Dr. A. S. DOWNING, New York State Department of Education.

Terms expiring in 1923: President FREDERICK C. FERRY, Hamilton College; Dean GEORGE A. REAVIS, University of Pittsburgh; Mr. WALTER R. MARSH, St. Paul's School; President HARVEY BRUMBAUGH, Juniata College.

Terms expiring in 1924: Dean JOHN H. LATANÉ, Johns Hopkins University; Professor GEORGE GAILEY CHAMBERS, University of Pennsylvania; Principal A. ALVIN SNOOK, Frankford High School; Dr. J. GEORGE BECHT, Assistant Commissioner of Education for Pennsylvania.

The President of the Association.

The Secretary of the Association

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITED SCHOOLS:

Terms expiring 1922: Miss MIRIAM A. BYTEL, St. Mary's School; Mr. SAMUEL M. NORTH, Maryland State Department of Education.

Terms expiring 1923: President JOHN H. DENBIGH, Packer Institute; Professor RADCLIFFE HEERMANCE, Princeton University.

Terms expiring 1924: Headmaster WILLIAM M. IRVINE, Mercersburg Academy; Dean GEORGE A. REAVIS, University of Pittsburgh, Chairman.

The President of the Association.

The Secretary of the Association.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 25

MORNING SESSION

GENERAL TOPIC: THE PRODUCT OF OUR SCHOOLS
AND COLLEGES

I. WHAT WE GET

DEAN JOHN H. LATANÉ, Johns Hopkins University.

The standards by which we judge the character and extent of the education of an individual differ from generation to generation. What are the tests which we should apply today? How can we distinguish an educated from an uneducated man? H. G. Wells, in his "Outline of History," makes the startling announcement that William E. Gladstone was an uneducated man. It is true, he says, that Gladstone interspersed his speeches with more or less inapt Greek and Latin quotations, but Gladstone lived in the age of Darwin, Huxley and Faraday, and to him science was a closed book. Gilbert Murray and Ernest Barker take issue with Wells in a series of animated footnotes, but the latter remains unshaken in his contention that Gladstone was uneducated. In "The Education of Henry Adams," the writer of this strange autobiography complains bitterly that his parents gave him an excellent eighteenth century education which was of little use to one who arrived at manhood in the middle of the nineteenth century.

Our educational standards are changing so rapidly today that it is not an easy matter to say who is educated and who is not educated. I have laid down a set of standards that naturally suggest themselves, and I shall proceed to discuss how far the average college graduate of today meets them.

(1) Culture and general information are what the public usually looks for in an educated man or woman and, less frequently, perhaps, some degree of expert knowledge. Culture is

a word that has always in the past been associated with education. Is the average college graduate of today a man of culture? I think we will all agree that he is not. Culture is in its nature more or less aristocratic, while democracy is the goal of present-day education. Only a rapidly diminishing number of college graduates can fairly be called men of culture. In fact, if you will examine the grouping of students in any of our larger colleges you will see that culture, in the old sense, is not one of the principal aims of education. The students who are going to college for general culture form the smallest of the four groups into which our student population is now divided. The other three groups, the pre-professional, the engineering and the business-economics, are much the largest. Education is becoming more democratic and more utilitarian. In attempting to provide a university education for every young man and every young woman who wants it, as most of our State universities are now doing, we have abandoned culture as the prime aim of education. We are "selling education" to the masses and making the State pay for it. In doing so, we are, I believe, necessarily lowering the standards. It is impossible to lift an entire democracy up to the level of the old idea of culture. If the idea prevails that everybody is entitled to a college education, no process of elimination can be effectively applied. We have even abandoned the old idea that democracy means equality of opportunity and adopted the socialistic idea that democracy means sameness. A man who is widely known in the field of public education recently advanced the idea in a conversation with me that there should be no eliminating process because the dull students needed education more than the bright ones to give them a start in life. In reply I said that the logical deduction from his remark would be somewhat as follows: Exceptionally bright students should not be permitted to go beyond the elementary school; pupils of average intelligence should be sent through the high school; dull students should be sent to college, and morons should be forced to take the Ph.D degree. Thus they would all start in life as equals.

In giving higher education to the many, are we not in danger of neglecting the few who are really worth while? As Goldwin Smith wrote some years ago of America: "Over the intellectual dead-level of this democracy, opinion courses like the tide running

in over a flat." We had an illustration of this in the last Presidential election.

If education does not impart culture, the next question is, does it impart general information? Here the answer is not so easy. A century ago it was possible for a student to cover most of the subjects taught in an American college. Today he can cover only a limited number of them. Still, I think that we can say that the average college graduate possesses a considerable amount of general information. It used to be said that the college graduate should know something about everything and everything about something. Does the average man leave college with much expert knowledge? Quite a large number do, not only in the technical schools like engineering, but even in the college of arts and sciences.

(2) One of the most obvious tests of the old education was the power of expression, the correct use of the mother tongue in written and oral language. Does the college graduate of today use correct English and is he able to write effectively? I fear we cannot claim very much for the average college graduate in this particular. Not many of them speak correctly, and very few have any conception of writing as an art. Even graduate students are noticeably deficient in this respect. It is a rare thing to find one who can write correctly and effectively.

(3) Another mark of an educated man is the power of observation and reflection. The college undoubtedly develops these faculties to a considerable extent, observation, I should say, more than reflection. Closely associated with these is the power of imagination which, of course, is in a certain sense inborn, but which may be developed through study and reflection. A certain degree of scientific imagination is essential to success in the laboratory sciences, just as a certain degree of historical imagination is necessary in the field of history and allied studies.

(4) We expect to find in the college graduate some evidence of originality and independent judgment and initiative. Originality again is inborn, but it may be developed by a college education, notwithstanding Ingersoll's definition of a university as a place where "diamonds are dimmed and pebbles are polished." I think that the modern college does a great deal in developing independence of judgment, and I believe that the American college in par-

ticular develops in the average student a considerable degree of initiative. Certainly, as compared with any other group of men, college graduates possess initiative in a marked degree. This was amply demonstrated during the world war. College graduates made good in almost every sort of activity that they undertook. How much of this initiative is due to education on its formal side and how much is the result of extra curricular activities is a matter on which opinion is divided. A recent writer on the American university—Professor Holme, of Sydney, Australia—scored a point on us in his comment on the use of the term “student activities.” He said that he found this term used by college professors from Maine to California, and in no single case was there present in the mind of the user any idea that study was a part of a student’s activities.

(5) Do we cultivate in our students a correct attitude toward life or a sense of social responsibility? No student pays or begins to pay for his education even in those colleges where tuition is charged, and in the great State universities he usually gets it for nothing. Why these great endowments and State subsidies if not to turn out good citizens and useful members of society? Here again I think that the college is performing its mission. As compared with any other group in the community, the college graduates do, I believe, feel this sense of social responsibility. Not all of them, of course, are public spirited, but most of our leaders in all lines of social endeavor come from this group.

(6) Do we develop in our students an abiding faith in the larger things of life—idealism? Humanity would make little progress without idealism and optimism. During the past generation our colleges have undoubtedly turned out a great many men who were cynical and critical, and who did very little that was really constructive. Their state of mind reflected to a large extent the attitude of many college professors. But I think the world war has wrought a change here. The average college professor was aroused from his attitude of superior indifference to the ordinary things of life to a compelling interest in the crises through which we were passing. The hope of the future lies with the college man. We have become a world power, the United States Senate to the contrary notwithstanding. We cannot be in the world and not of it. The international situation is so com-

plex that only an enlightened public opinion can direct our course, and we must look to the educated classes for this.

(7) Does our modern education implant in the student the power of growth? Does it really stimulate his intellectual life? The average man of forty is the victim of arrested development. His mind has become set like cement. He is not capable of relinquishing old ideas or acquiring new ones. After he passes middle life his mind becomes reminiscent and not forward-looking. Only a great intellectual stimulus can insure continued mental development. Mental growth, of course, means change. In a changing world consistency is a doubtful virtue. As Cardinal Newman once said: "To live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often." Open-mindedness is a characteristic of the educated man. He is willing to recognize mistakes and to draw new conclusions from new facts. Without open-mindedness there can be no intellectual honesty, and this is, of course, the highest virtue that the educated man can attain. If we can develop in our students the power of growth, open-mindedness and intellectual honesty, the college will stand fully justified by its product.

2. WHAT WE WANT

PROFESSOR KATHARINE J. GALLAGHER, Goucher College.

In approaching this topic—the *Aims of College Education*—one is embarrassed by the knowledge that the best that can be said upon the subject has already been said. The continuous interest, however, which the subject arouses among educators indicates its fundamental nature and its virility, and upon a matter which is at once vital and growing, the last word can never be spoken with finality.

There is, I believe, one great aim in college education, but this aim is not necessarily hostile to all others. It is generally conceded—by the teaching profession, at least—that *intellectual development* is the great end of college training. This is a tenet of faith held desperately even where it is most insecurely supported by fact. It is so widely held, indeed, that it must, I believe, become the foundation of the college credo. "A college," says President Meiklejohn, "to be a liberal college must be essentially intellectual." But there is no royal road to intellectual development, and under the banner of intellectual training bands of

the faithful may march over various roads to the city of understanding. There is room, therefor, for a variety of secondary aims in college education without unfaithfulness to its ultimate purpose.

The proper aims which ought to follow and assist intellectual training are, I believe, matters of opinion, and not of fact. They might, therefor, vary materially from one college to another and still be proper aims. That they do not do so is, it seems to me, a thing to be regretted. To a certain extent, the standardization of college aims as a whole indicates that faculties are not stating and restating the objections before them in the light of contemporary needs and of their own especial facilities. So timid are many teaching groups regarding any innovations, or so content with the ancient inspiration concerning the purposes of college training, that no thought whatever is expended, in some places, upon the subject of direction, but each is eagerly upon the way. The character of the teaching done in our colleges would, I believe, be significantly improved if the general subject of college aims were definitely reviewed at appropriate intervals. Every college should have distinct and stated aims held definitely before its teaching force as the goal toward which especial efforts in that particular institution are to be expended.

Professor Paul Shorey has reminded us in one of his interesting discussions regarding the college curriculum that one should always speak upon a proposition and not upon a word. As a caption, "The Aims of College Education," are but words. Aim, as is well known, is a derivative from the old German spelling of "haim," and means the home point, the particular spot to which one's efforts are directed, the goal which is always had in view, and to the attainment of which everything is made to bend. It differs from an aspiration in that an aim, like a target, can and *must* be reached if markmanship is good. It differs from an ideal in that it includes not only the end in view, but the efforts directed toward it as well. With these considerations in mind, we can evolve our elementary propositions: First, that every college should have *intellectual discipline* as its *primary* aim if it wishes to retain its rank as a college; second, that this primary aim will be more readily attained if the college would analyze the specific efforts made toward its accomplishment and in so doing conscious-

ly develop a set of subsidiary aims which they especially wish to realize; and third, that such a college, having determined upon its aims and objectives, should organize its total activities in such a way as to *make sure* that these particular aims shall be the minimum attainment of college education within that institution.

The *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* has declared that the two objections usually brought against the college today are "vagueness of aim and lack of intellectual stamina." If this be true, it is the more to be regretted because it is exactly this matter of *intellectual stamina* which the guild of college teachers would, I believe, substantially agree is the main purpose of the college. This, perhaps, is the only point upon which they would substantially agree. It is, to my mind, the only point upon which they need agree. There are educators who would make this the exclusive aim of the college. "The life of this country," says ex-President Wilson, "is going to be purified only when colleges wake up to the fact that their reason for existence is intellectual." But whether this be regarded as the exclusive aim, or as the primary aim, the fact remains that among those who direct and administer the actual process of college education it is generally given the initial place in the statement of college purposes. I know of no liberal college which would openly avow that intellectual development was a secondary issue in its consideration. Colleges are, nevertheless, numerous which confuse ideals with aims, and I believe it holds to an alarming extent that the activities of the college life are not directed primarily toward intellectual growth. Such colleges may be said to have intellectual aspirations upon the attainment of which they do not care (or do not dare) to insist. Such a college may attain other aims of great value in themselves, but it should either reorganize its activities or restate its aims. No good results can follow the maintainance of false colors. The human mind thinks clearly with great difficulty and only after painful training, and for the college itself to set an example of muddled thinking is but to confound confusion and to lead forward to the rear.

"The great defect in American college education," says Dean Haskins, "is that it does not set the mass of students intellectually on fire. Our colleges are only in an imperfect degree intellectual institutions." We all realize that the imperative need in the world

today is for men and women who are not motivated by prejudice and preference, instinct and passion, as most of us are motivated in four-fifths of our conduct, but who can think, and feel, and understand the issues that are before us and can act upon judgments intelligently framed. It is possible that such leadership can never be largely attained, but the college has the primary duty of helping to make such leadership possible, and if it allows that duty to become obscured, it will have to surrender its place of importance in American life. That it does not accomplish a more notable success in preparing for leadership, I believe, due in part (though in part only) to the unwillingness of the college to face the issue and live up in fact to its avowed intellectual aims.

It is very generally true that the leaders of our student bodies, the very ones we most covet as the acolytes for our intellectual altars, are drawn out and weighed down with administrative duties in their student organizations and student activities. They derive a real efficiency and much executive training from many of these occupations, it is true, but it is their personality which is developed—a personality which they already possessed to a marked degree and which makes them the very ones we yearn to inspire more fully in our classrooms. An effective personality with the power to influence followers is not lacking in any walk of American life. It is developed in our labor unions. It is developed in our women's clubs. And, while the college should do its part in permitting the widest development for personality and executive efficiency, it must be remembered that it is the *addition of intellectual discipline* to such a personality that is the *distinctive contribution* of the college. That these non-intellectual activities frequently make a deeper impression upon our students than any other in their college life is an indictment against the way in which we have allowed the *intellectual* interests to be outdistanced in our colleges. It is not that these activities could, or should, be destroyed, but, as has been continually pointed out by students of this problem of longer experience and greater consideration than I can claim, there is a need for reorganizing the college activities into *one unified machine* with faculty and students functioning together, and with the intellectual activities in the ascendancy, rather than in two rival machines of curricular and extra-curricular natures as is the case at present in many colleges. The solu-

tion of this difficulty has already been approached, in some places, by means of student counselors, who are also members of the academic faculty. The efficacy of this step will depend upon the function of the counselor in the student machine, and the ability of the counselor clearly to recognize the importance of the intellectual domination of the college. More common are the mixed faculty and student councils, which work even more fundamentally in the right direction, but the problem has not yet been solved. It can, I believe, be solved if the college has the courage and the intelligence to approach the difficulty with honesty and with understanding.

It is possible, however, to reverse the statement that there is too much emphasis upon extra-curricular activities in most of our colleges. Such a reversal brings the responsibility back to the place where, to my mind, it rightfully belongs. There is in our colleges too little emphasis and ability demonstrated in the framing and administering of the curriculum. "The systematic mind," says President Hibben, "does not develop out of a miscellany of intellectual interests." It is no longer possible to cover the field of human knowledge, or, indeed, even to introduce the student to the field of human knowledge in four years, or forty years, or, perhaps, four hundred years. A scattering of intellectual interests is not liberty. It is license, and is inimical to intellectual discipline. It is impossible to offer everything that is good to be known, or everything that the student might earnestly desire to know. Faculties are too prone to overlook the limits of their own omniscience, and colleges must place a wholesome restriction upon their curricular ambitions for purpose of efficiency. Furthermore, in so far as there is an evident relation among the various branches of learning there must be effective direction, or even compulsion, from above in framing the college course. This, it has seemed to me, is becoming continuously more apparent to the directors of our colleges.

Because our graduates have been turned out (or so it is claimed) to some extent undisciplined and unfit for the drudgery of practical work in the world, pressure has been exerted from without (and in some cases even from within) to introduce into the curriculum such subjects as will be of direct vocational value, and to permit a degree of specialization which, it is urged, will

be of greater practical usefulness in the outside world than the present policy of the liberal college. To admit, however, that the college has not completely fulfilled its highest function does not necessitate the scrapping of our entire ideal. All subjects with an ideational content are good, but all are not equally good for the purposes of broad, fundamental, intellectual training. To take from chemistry, for instance, only those ideas which can be applied directly to cooking will have the result, perhaps, of turning out a cook with greater rapidity, but it has the more important result of necessitating the loss of much that is most valuable in chemistry as a preparation for life as a whole. No subject, moreover, be it never so valuable as training, is good to the exclusion of all other subjects. The liberal college exists to free *all* the faculties of the mind. Certain tastes and interests on the part of a student indicate the aptitude of his or her mind and they should be developed, but they are likely also to indicate certain limitations in other directions. The mind which inclines to practical thinking only, for instance, is not free to face the whole of life, for much of experience cannot be met by exact conclusion upon irrefutable evidence, nor, on the other hand, is the student whose undeniable bent for literary appreciation inclines him to that one line of application only, capable of meeting life's most serious problems without some training of those faculties which he uses with less ease. The problems of the world today are so complex and so various that training in one kind of thinking only, to the neglect of other kinds of intellectual development, will not prepare one to help in their solution. The training in our colleges should be so directed as to fit our graduates for *living*, not primarily for the getting of a livelihood. There is, as Thornstein Veblen has said, in the minds of the intelligent public a long-term bias which will not permanently permit the college to confuse the means of life with its end.

If the college curriculum is so framed that it introduces the student to the method of thinking from evidence, as is done in the sciences; of analyzing and feeling emotions, ideals and standards of beauty, as is done in the humanities and the literatures of the various peoples of the world; of speculating upon and understanding the great moral problems of life, as is done in philosophy and its allied subjects, and of realizing the nature of

human progress and the development of human institutions, as is done in history and the social and political sciences—if this is done rigorously, and with an insistence upon even the *minimum* of intellectual content that each of these branches contains, the college will face no need of altering its larger aims of intellectual growth. If, furthermore, this intellectual program is not permitted to be overshadowed by any other activities, no matter how desirable those activities may be, the American college, I believe, will come into its birthright as an intellectual institution, a birthright which is in danger of being lost to sight in the multiplicity of interests which our complex lives are forcing upon us.

There are those, as I have indicated, perhaps there are those in this audience, who will claim that having introduced the student to various methods of thought so that he can face the complexity of human problems, and having permitted him to develop naturally along the lines in which he has the greatest aptitude, but having also attempted to correct his mental vision by helping him to utilize, to some extent, his more restricted faculties, the college has performed its *exclusive service*. Indeed, this is a full-sized program for any group of mere human beings who are themselves only imperfectly intelligent. The needs of our times, however, are forcing upon us a group of secondary aims which may well be included as partial results of our primary object, but which, I believe, gain cogency by being specifically emphasized, and, being specifically emphasized, make necessary some particular policies in the administration of the college course.

I do not refer to those great fundamentals—such as virtue and character. These are not aims in themselves, but the by-product of our intellectual development. The foundations of virtue and character must be laid before the student reaches college if they are to be fully attained, and the duty of the college regarding them is an imperious duty, to be sure, but it is the same intellectual duty which has been already emphasized. It is the obligation of aiding the student to get a clear sense of values, and the disciplinary duty of seeing to it that the student performs faithfully and to the best of his ability each particular task he has in hand. Mental hardiness, virtue and character will result from these practices. Softness and laxity in the administration of our intellectual function, irregularities regarding intellectual duties,

will bring their result upon the *character* of our students more indelibly than upon their mental growth, for mental deficiencies can be made good, but habits which form the basis of character can only be acquired by long continued practice.

I do refer, however, to such aims as take their rise in the worthwhile activities of our day—such aims as intelligent citizenship, social leadership, refinement of taste and conduct (which are certainly vitally needed at the present time), and special efficiency in some one or some group of intellectual activities. It is customary, I notice, and has been customary for institutions of learning to claim for themselves pre-eminent efficiency in all intellectual activities. It is true that there are institutions so favorably situated as to location, personnel, clientele and financial support that these claims can be substantiated to, at least, a respectable degree. But I believe the time has come for most institutions to take stock of themselves in relation to their avowed aims.

The equipment necessary for the fullest development in many lines of study has become so extensive and so costly that complete facilities for every department of training are well nigh impossible for many colleges. The physical location of the college as to the proximity of cities where extensive advantages exist for certain forms of work—say social work, the presence of rival institutions which already offer special advantages in various lines which it would be unprofitable to try completely to duplicate, much more to surpass, these and innumerable other factors should make it evident even to college faculties, composed of members, each intent upon expanding his own specialty to the maximum that there are, in certain colleges, differential advantages in regard to certain lines of study which it is inefficient to neglect, and which, on the contrary, ought to be intelligently exploited.

It is true, for instance, that all colleges retain a sufficient esteem for the classics to insure the presence of classical departments in every institution, and such a teaching force and library equipment as will make it possible to pursue a classical course, but it is an added advantage to those who believe in that especial type of training when it is made known, as is the case in several of our most honored institutions, that a few colleges have the conviction and the courage to make the classics pre-eminently im-

portant in their scheme of college education. It is then known that in these institutions all of those values of discipline, of ideals, of aesthetics and of the destruction of provincialism which accrue from a rich classical background may be found to the best advantage. This does not imply that the sciences, philosophy or the social studies will be neglected in these institutions, but simply that especial facilities are offered for the so-called classical education which is being subordinated to other types of intellectual development in many if not most of our colleges.

It is desirable that some group of colleges should select as the focal point in their educational policy those subjects which lead pre-eminently to intelligent citizenship and public service. Where the classics have lost ground some other subject or subjects have been substituted, which give the long range view and the detachment necessary to the educated mind. In many cases this subject has been history. History and the political, social and educational sciences would form the natural background for such an emphasis upon citizenship. While all liberal colleges must offer opportunities for studying the course of human development and the structure of present-day society, a declaration that citizenship was an especial aim would indicate that in that particular group of colleges the opportunities for such study had been made a special point of policy. It must be remembered, in this connection, that the newer humanities—history, economics and the social and political studies suffer especially in most institutions at the present time. They are, perhaps, humanities, but, at the same time, they are susceptible to application of scientific methods to a certain degree, and they ought not to be pursued in exactly the same manner as the older humanities. Yet seldom is it even conceived by college administrations that these subjects should be provided with sufficient facilities to make possible individual oversight from the teaching force, or with adequate library materials—that is, both wide enough, and in sufficient duplication to make possible individual progress. These things are done without question in the laboratory staffs and laboratory equipment for the natural sciences, which is as it should be. But emphasis upon the newer humanities would be possible in colleges enlightened as to the real needs of these departments, and

located in places favorable for the study of social and industrial phenomena.

By these suggestions it is not intended to encourage an alteration of the college curriculum in the direction of specialization, but to urge the restatement of aims based upon the realization that some colleges have certain natural advantages in regard to certain subjects in the curriculum. Emphasis could well be placed upon the sciences, or the modern languages, or the aesthetic and cultural branches, when special facilities exist along these lines, and this can be done without detriment to those departments which are not so stressed. The status of these departments would remain adequate, and would be at least as favorable as at the present time when each college is duplicating the service of every other.

There would still remain many, indeed, most colleges which have no differential advantage to declare. Even in these institutions, however, it is possible, and desirable, that there should be a greater cogency as to aims. I believe that it is inevitable that colleges should differ on these secondary aims. That there is at present such concurrence on the point is, to my mind, an indication that the problem has not yet received the thought and judgment it deserves. There are certain types of intellectual development so necessary in the world today that the stressing of them in our educational institutions is not a departure from our catholicity of purpose, but an evidence that we are sensitive to the nature of our times, and that we recognize that the college is the place to develop the necessary intellectual leadership.

It is along the line of these secondary aims that the colleges for women, or some few of them, might well take a distinctive stand. Intellectual development per se takes no cognizance of sex, and the women's colleges have properly insisted upon this fact in word and by deed. They have refused, and rightly refused, to include within their curriculum a host of household activities which were urged upon them as essentially feminine. To abandon this policy would be an ignominious surrender after a notable victory. Vocational interests of women are as essentially inimical to the broadest liberal education as are the vocational interests of men. But by physical nature, the activities of women are peculiarly susceptible to classification, and some recognition of the overwhelming importance of the function of women as the bearers

and rearers of children might well be evidenced by the aims and policies of some of the women's colleges. This has been done by the college in which I have the honor to serve in its emphasis upon physiology and hygiene as a regularly conducted science required in *addition to* and *after* the pursuit of the usual scientific requirements. Now that there is no longer need for that earlier insistence upon the equality of the woman's college with the man's, the educators of women might well consider whether it is not time to study the essential activities of women with a view to analyzing their intellectual content. In secondary aims the colleges for women might profitably present a list which would not always duplicate the aims of the colleges for men.

This task of classifying the aims of our college education should be one of primary importance to each college faculty. No one, in all probability, would agree with all the particulars of any classification I might evolve for my ideal college, and no large number would agree with the whole classification of any one administrator. It should be the work of a group, rather than of one mind. The supreme college administrator—the President—is as unfit, by himself, to evolve these aims as any other academic person. His peculiar bias as an administrator, the executive of a running machine which must be made to go, is as complete a bias as is that of any one of his faculty, who, being a specialist in some one line, would inevitably give that line a material preference. To be of the greatest benefit, such a classification must be made by a large group. The larger the group, the smaller, naturally, will be the list of aims upon which they will agree, but the value to those participating in such a classification would be inestimable.

Once having charted the course, the most difficult task is yet to be accomplished, in its application. The present array of college activities has developed gradually from natural causes, and has not only the vitality of a natural growth, but very real benefits which might easily be destroyed. The application of more definite aims demands a wise, clear-sighted, and honest adjustment of already existing activities rather than any destruction or upheaval. In the last analysis the success or failure of college education comes back to the educators themselves. Our colleges have already proved themselves essentially healthy. It is for us to see how we can improve the defects which they still retain.

In framing and directing our educational policy, it must be remembered above all that the American college was originally founded for service. It is not true, as has often been stated, that it took its origin as a vocational school for the clergy. A study of the charters and early policies of the colonial colleges will invalidate that contention. From the beginning, however, the college was intended to serve the community. Throughout the history of the American college, this ideal of service has been maintained. The College is an institution distinct from the University and distinct from the Vocational School. While we have the obligation of keeping it true to its intellectual traditions, we have also the duty of emphasizing service to our own especial time. The American college is not primarily a place of advanced scholarship. Perhaps the instruction given there and the training secured could never properly be described as scholarly, although it may well serve as a training school for future scholarship, but it is now essentially what it has been in the past, a preparatory school for contemporary American life. It is not that one should become provincial as to time, and apply oneself only to contemporary problems. Educational myopia will not aid in the solution of the present needs. Perspective is best secured by the study of long-range developments and of ideas somewhat remote from our immediate environment. But I believe that no institution has the moral right in these times of stress and strain to turn out students absolutely ignorant of developments in the world today. Especially has no institution the right to forget its heritage as a ministrant to present needs. Let us select our intellectual aims with a view to developing whatever services we think we can best attain, and let us see to it that we attain them, but in addition to this, let us bring our students to a realization of the social obligations of culture, and inspire them with an eagerness to be of use to their generation in whatever direction that usefulness may lie.

3. HOW CAN WE IMPROVE THE PRODUCT?

(a) *Vitalizing the Teaching.*

PRESIDENT FREDERICK C. FERRY, Hamilton College.

Vitalizing the teaching seems a subject of greater importance at present than ever before. It was written long ago that when Germany founds a colony she establishes first an arsenal, France a railroad, Great Britain a custom house, but America a school. So we have specialized in education, and in that fact is to be found a large part of the explanation of the amazing material development of this great country.

But we read that within five years the increase of undergraduates enrolled in the universities has grown by fifty-five per cent. Classes numbering as many as seven hundred are meeting to receive instruction together in some of the large institutions. It has been necessary to increase decidedly the salaries of teachers and the money has not been nearly large enough to make it possible for the great staff of additional teachers to be of as high quality as those doing the teaching a few years ago. The men have not been sufficient in number who have gained broad experience in teaching and have acquired a wealth of scholarship.

So, with this great increase in numbers, there has come a time of critical test of the colleges and universities. This great tide of numbers seems not to be ephemeral but to be deep and lasting. But it will be deep and lasting only if the colleges and universities continue to make their product worth while, so that it will be true a generation hence that those who figure over the results in college education will come out with favorable conclusions of the sort that they do find nowadays.

So it is a time of test of the colleges and universities. Can the instruction under the present circumstances be kept up to the grade of years ago? To do so calls for the vitalization of the teaching.

Long ago education was regarded chiefly disciplinary. The old woman who lived in a shoe in the nursery rhyme lived up to the principle of education of those days when, after distributing broth to some and bread to others she gave them all, impartially,

consistently, periodically, the discipline that was counted good in those days. Mark Twain said, "Don't reason with a child, thrash him. It is much easier." And so long as the ferrule accompanied the execution of the lesson assigned, there seems not to have been so much need of vitalizing the teaching as in the latter days.

The very fact that a child disliked a subject constituted a sufficient argument for the teaching of that subject to that child. Even Martineau insisted that the need of the child was shown by his distaste for the subject taught; the weak side of his nature lay there and it should be strengthened. But after a little while the age of obedient children gave way to the age of obedient parents and there came in the elective system, under which the child was to select the things that he should study. Some went so far as to insist that the educational process must become entirely painless, that the child should study only what he pleases, when he pleases, as he pleases, and if he pleases; that he must be led by interest and not by compulsion. Thus came serious need of the vitalizing of the teaching. And if the child and the undergraduate were to be left to select for himself the subjects that he wanted to study, why should he not, if he wanted to study no subject at all, be allowed to make that choice? Professors came into competition at that time for the securing of classes that they might teach, and great weakness in general came in many lines in the college and university teaching. There was an increase of need of the vitalizing of the teaching.

So an attempt was made to vitalize the teaching by making it plainly and effectively vocational, and that seems to have gone so far in some cases as to make people believe that, if a boy was to be a manufacturer of shoes for his life work, he should be taught through his school and college days to manufacture shoes; and that, if a girl were to be a stenographer for life, she should be taught through her school and college days stenography. Consequently a great part of the best that has been said and thought and done in this old world should be forever a matter of strangeness, complete strangeness, to the person so educated.

But there has come a turn in the matter of things educational; the teaching will not be vitalized so thoroughly any longer by the fact that the boy is conscious of his studying the particular task that he is to perform through life.

A little while ago there was a meeting attended by a committee made up of the representatives of those industrial organizations that employ in largest numbers graduates of colleges and technical schools and attended also by a committee representative of the colleges and universities, in an attempt to profit through mutual free conference concerning methods and aims in education. Those representing the colleges and universities were very much startled to hear a high officer in the firm that is said to employ in largest number graduates of colleges and technical schools speak after this fashion: "We are particular, as we have been for a number of years, to insure that no graduate civil engineer coming from a technical school into our employ shall be given a task in civil engineering; no graduate of mechanical engineering may do mechanical engineering when he comes to us, and similarly for the other specialized preparations. In every instance we insist upon a change of his specialty." And the college people said, "How can that be justified? That is the very thing that he has been taught all those years to do, and it has been easier to teach him because he has known that that was what he was to do." And this officer replied that "Nothing is sounder. We found that if we let a civil engineer do civil engineering and an electrical engineer do electrical engineering and a mechanical engineer do mechanical engineering with us, that he did the task easily and well, but after ten years he was practically no larger than when he entered our employ. Whereas by forcing him to take up a new line of activity we insure that after ten years he knows not one thing but at least two. We are sure that we are right."

There was sitting at that conference a dean of an engineering school and he said, "That interests me, and I have been thinking over the cases of about twenty-five or thirty men who graduated with me twenty years ago in civil engineering. I can recall ten or eleven of those men who have continued steadily in civil engineering and not one of them has acquired great distinction in life, not one of them has gained a very high place. I can recall about fifteen of my classmates who for some reason or other were shifted from civil engineering to something else, and of most of those men it is true that they have achieved large success in life."

Then the officer who had spoken for a change of specialty said, "This thing amuses us and we often speak of it:—that we

like so well to bring into our employ graduates of the classical colleges. They come knowing nothing of what we want them to do and oftentimes conscious that they know nothing of what is demanded of them. But we find that at whatever task we set them they make amazing progress in learning the methods of that task. They seem to us to be specialists in method and they grow amazingly under our employ. And," he continued, "we think we understand why that is so. We think that the object of education is flexibility of mind, and that flexibility of mind is developed under a system where one does not stay at one kind of task through four years or even through a single day, but goes the first hour in the morning to the laboratory, and pretty soon that same morning to an exercise in literature; before the day is over to a class in philosophy or a recitation in history. So we believe that the thing that is best in the boys who come to us to enter our employ is the possession of such a flexibility of mind and familiarity with so wide a range of methods as will enable them to pick up quickly the method of any task that is assigned."

Now then the vocational vitalizing of the teaching,—the fact that we are giving exactly the work that the boy or girl needs to know for the future,—constitutes not quite so direct or effective an appeal after many people have come to believe what that man believes and announces already as to flexibility of mind rather than specialized training as an object of education. A distinguished statesman to whom this announcement of the officer of that industrial company was reported said, "Of course that is true. Have you not noticed that in the long run a lawyer does much better in a governmental task to which he is new and strange than a man of any other profession or business? And that is because an active lawyer was for a week, a month ago, a practicing physician, because he had a case involving medicine, where he was required practically to master a considerable field of medicine in order to handle that case. The next week he was perhaps an authority in transportation, for he had a case in railroading or shipping. And the next week his professional task lay in some distinct and still other field. And the man whose mind is kept going week after week from the details of one field to the details of another develops and keeps a flexibility of mind that makes him ready for the next

task." If these things are true, the vocational appeal will help us less in vitalizing our teaching.

Some time ago Mr. Fisher, the British Commissioner of Education, announced that one of the great objects of education was to fit people for the proper use of leisure. Those of you who read the first article in the October number of the *Atlantic Monthly* of this year will recall that that article presents a very strong appeal for the education of our young people, particularly those of the industrial classes, for the proper use of leisure. He calls attention to the fact that, with our automatic machinery in the factories, our young men are coming very early in life to their point of greatest efficiency and their time of largest income, and they are going about with their pockets full of money and with more and more time on their hands for leisure as the working day is shortened, buying pleasures, buying companionships, buying fine raiment and trying to buy happiness, but failing ordinarily as to the last point. They are quite unconscious of their need of interest in what has been done by the men of the past, is being done by the men of today and what must be done by the men of the future. They are not aware of the fact that our system of civilization has been bought at great cost. And what, he says, shall be done to make this man have understanding of the past, interest in the present, sympathy with the future? His answer is that from history and literature and science and art and music they must be taught,—not a vocation; they have no need of much further knowledge as to the running of that automatic machine; they learn that in a few hours or at most in a few days. They need, as he insists, not a vocation but an avocation, that they may be able to spend the hours of leisure in a proper and helpful and safe fashion. So far as that ideal goes, the vocational appeal will help little to vitalize teaching.

How then shall teaching be vitalized? You have all heard of the Turner method, a new thought in education, insisting that the most effectual and natural discipline for the human mind comes from the taking of earnest and serious thought concerning the things that one does and sees and handles in the daily life; that we should develop "thinking laborers" in the industrial classes and "laborious thinkers" in the more highly educated classes. That system, the Turner method, has been tried, as you know, more or less in sev-

eral of the scientific schools. It is in an attempt to carry that Turner system still further that changes have been made within a little while in the curricula and methods of some of the largest technical schools. That is the method which influenced most the United States Army in the development of its system of instruction during the war. Though that war period brought us that unwelcome S. A. T. C. experience, the colleges were saved for the time by that method. And when we think unkindly of those days we ought to pause and ask ourselves what would have become of all of us had not the War Department helped out by that innovation which we disliked so much? But the Army has developed an educational system and it has vitalized its teaching. There the instructors take a group of nine men out into a field where there is a bridge and call their attention to that bridge and to a 12-inch howitzer standing near and say, "For the next week or ten days (or maybe a month) your task is to determine whether that 12-inch howitzer can be drawn over that bridge; is the bridge able to support the howitzer?"—a definite problem in the handling of which general principles must be learned. Years ago the colleges and universities taught the general principle without much application to the problem. The laboratory has come and the principle is applied to the problem in the laboratory now. But here in the Army is the other extreme, and that constitutes vital teaching. The expense in time is great. Will all the nine men work out the problem or will one work it out and the rest gain it from him? One fears that the group of men may be too large for the best results. When that problem is done, a water tower standing near is pointed out and the men are told that it is to be feared that some heavy gale of wind will tip that water tower over. "You are to determine how strong a wind that water tower will stand without toppling over." There again is vitalized teaching.

I believe that equally vitalized teaching is to be found to a large extent in many of our colleges and universities. I know of a small classical college where the professor of geology, after teaching the general principles for a little while, sends the boys of his class out for practical problems. One such problem recently was to determine the possibilities of a nearby river for purposes of waterpower; the two undergraduates to whom that task was assigned took hold of their work in fine spirit and had practically

finished it when there arrived a group of professional engineers sent by a great company to undertake that very same problem. The boys realized that they were handling a vital question.

Another undergraduate, under the influence of that same teacher, became in the course of a single year's work in geology so interested in the making of brick out of clay that he wandered over a great portion of his state in the summer vacations testing the different clays by actually baking bricks of the different kinds of clay that he found. And that youngster, who was not regarded as of a very serious turn of mind at all, sold his report of a summer's labor to a large concern interested in the baking of brick. There, I would maintain, is very beautifully vitalized teaching.

In another instance, the teacher of government and law spends a half of the year actually participating as senator in the making of laws, and comes back to teach the boys in the other half how laws are made. There again is vitalized teaching. In another instance, the professor of economics goes to a neighboring city and addresses a club of seventy-five bankers weekly on the problems of banking, and comes back to the college and teaches the boys the principles of banking. Even in mathematics if the teacher is of the right sort he rouses the spark of vital response. A little while ago a teacher of analytical geometry, which seems to most people dry enough for any purpose, talked to his class about dimensions. Finally he drew a line across the blackboard and said, "There is the most beautiful example of one dimensional space that was ever discovered. That is time." He marked one end of the line "future" and the other end of it "past" and he put on it "present" and "the birth of Christ" and raised the question of the velocity of "present" through time, or time past "present," whichever it was; and the response from the class was electrical. When that exercise was over, one of these boys came up and said, "Professor, I never thought of time that way before and I like to think of it. I like so much to think of it that thinking about it makes me feel queer all over." There was vitalized teaching in a subject where unfortunately it ordinarily is not found.

So it seems to me that we come back for the vitalizing of teaching to the question of the individual teacher. A teacher of the larger sort will vitalize his teaching whatever his subject. The teacher of the other sort, of the kind that was characterized a

little while ago as of such poor quality that there was no coin small enough to represent the salary earned, that teacher can never vitalize teaching. But the colleges and universities and schools are blessed with many who can and do. And they are the ones who will save the present-day situation in education if it is to be saved. No salary can ever be made large enough adequately to pay those teachers, and their fame deserves to be everlasting. Their service to the nation is beyond all price.

It seems to me to be true, therefore, that the vocational appeal is not going to be sufficient to keep our teaching vital. Vitalized teaching depends upon the individual teacher. Though our colleges and universities may be built of marble and of gold, if equipped with ineffective teachers, they will be worth hardly anything; while the buildings may be poor wooden shacks and the salaries may be very small indeed and yet the teaching be such that there is found an institution of the highest grade of effective education.

HOW CAN WE IMPROVE THE PRODUCT?

(b) *Testing the Results.*

DR. J. CAYCE MORRISON, Specialist in Educational Measurements,
New York State Department.

As I heard the word "test" used by the previous speakers it occurred to me that my subject is well named. In my own college days I remember an excellent teacher, who was even a more excellent philosopher, lectured to us once upon our attitude towards tests in the college examinations; the gist of his lecture was that we did not take examinations in our colleges or schools or even in this life; that we had only tests; that each individual had one opportunity at an examination and that was the examination conducted by St. Peter.

I suppose that since teachers first conceived the idea of passing some students and failing others, or of placing marks upon papers or report cards, that we have had some conception of improving the results of our work through testing; and I suppose it is fair to assume that we thought we improved those results through the effect of the higher reward, whatever it may be, that went with the higher mark, or even a passing mark, or through the influence of the fear of failure on those who might go below the margin. Yet as we look about us, as we measure our work in view of the ideals that are coming forth and the tests that are being put to us by a cold, practical world, we are beginning to suspicion that our old scheme of testing does not hold all that we need and that there may be some other way of doing the job a little better and of improving the product of our work through a different sort of measurement. There are even those amongst us who say that the time is already here when we can well afford to scrap the old system entirely and launch out into new fields of endeavor. There are others of us who are weighing the thing in the balance and wondering what the outcome may be.

The physician diagnoses before he prescribes. I have in mind a certain secondary school where there were two teachers of first year algebra. One of those teachers had specialized in the teaching of algebra, the other had had the work partially wished upon

her. The second teacher came toward the middle of the year and found that her classes were failing, that her students disliked her, that she was not making the right sort of attack, and that her principal and her superintendent were becoming discouraged. She, finally, about the middle of the year, went to the principal and said, "What can I do?" The principal visited her classes, reported that she was failing and that there was evidently little hope. He pointed out certain things that she might do, but his visits necessarily were few and far between and his suggestions did not seem to eliminate the troubles; she went to her superintendent and said, "Come and visit my work. Tell me what I can do. I do not want to fail." After a visit to her class he suggested that they use a certain standardized algebra test or series of tests and find out if possible where her difficulties lay. Within a very short time the two teachers of algebra got together and in consultation with the principal decided that they would use the Hotz Standardized Algebra Test through the several classes. The tests included more than one hundred different types of problems, covering the fundamentals of first year algebra. When the tests had been given, the results were tabulated to show the different types of problems that gave trouble. The teachers took up the papers and analyzed the results to find what specific processes or elements in each particular type of problem was causing the mischief; with the result that the one teacher found that her classes in the very fundamentals of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division were doing splendid work and had achieved results that were entirely in keeping with the expectations. But in the so-called written or reasoning problems and in the solution of formal equations she found that she had not succeeded, even though she had attempted to teach those phases of the subject. Having analyzed the problems and found where her weaknesses were, she went back in the classroom with renewed faith that she could do the thing. Before the end of the year her classes again found confidence in their teacher, they again found confidence in themselves, and at the end of the year her classes stood just as high by every measure that was put to them as the classes from the more experienced and more successful teacher at the beginning of the year.

Similarly we might point out instance after instance where a new type of test has been devised to help teachers and instructors

diagnose their work, to find what elements of the subject matter were causing students trouble, to find what students were in difficulty and what their peculiar mental difficulties were.

We could carry the illustration even further to show the effect that comes from testing the results. I remember two teachers working side by side in an elementary school. A certain test was given at the beginning of the year, a standardized test covering the fundamental phases of the work that they were supposed to teach in a particular subject. When the results were tabulated one of those classes fell considerably below the standard. The other class measured well up to the standard. The second class made a score of $14\frac{1}{2}$, which was well up to standard or above. The other class made a score of 8.6, which was considerably below the standard. It was the beginning of the year; both teachers were new to those particular pupils and each teacher had the privilege of asking herself "What shall I do to improve the situation?"

The one teacher whose class measured up fairly well accepted the results without question. The other teacher, discouraged, thinking perhaps even though she had only met those pupils, that something in her own work was at fault, began to study the situation. She took up the subject matter that had caused a considerable portion of the class to fail and she worked over those parts until she was sure that her class understood them. Then she began to study those individual pupils who were having difficulty, and found time both in and out of class to help them. Toward the end of the year a similar test, a test of equal difficulty or value, was given to the same group of pupils; the one class that made a score of $14\frac{1}{2}$ in the autumn made a score of $16\frac{1}{2}$; and the class which had made a score of 8.6 in the autumn made a score of 17.3 in May. In other words, the second class, the class whose teacher had taken the results, analyzed them and had found a means of eliminating the difficulty, had made a gain of nearly two years' work.

I have but five minutes. We are not interested so much in these days in our schools and colleges in measuring the material results of our teaching, we are not counting success today so much in how much algebra and geometry or Latin or French or arithmetic or reading a child may learn. Rather we are facing a time, I suppose, when our chief interests shall be in the character of

men and women that go out from our schools and from our colleges, in those qualities or characteristics with which men are counted a success in life and without which they are counted failures.

It was written by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created free and equal. I sometimes have thought that there are only two classes of people in America that have ever taken that sentence seriously; one is the politicians and the other is school teachers. In the case of the politicians the validity of the statement was very well illustrated in the municipal election in New York City a few days ago. It is the acceptance of that principle or bit of philosophy by school teachers that has resulted in our educational system being formulated in large part, particularly in the lower grades of schools, on the needs of the average child. We looked at the average child, we thought in terms of the average child, until a very few years ago when a certain group of young men came to the forefront, and pointed out a very serious problem of retardation. Since then the people engaged in administering schools largely supported by public funds have given a good deal of attention to the question of retardation; so much so that some days ago I heard a very successful superintendent of schools in one of our larger cities say in an assembly such as this that he advised his teachers in teachers' meetings that they were not paid to teach the upper or brighter half of their students, that these would get along by themselves; but that they were paid to teach the lower half and particularly the lower quarter that needed them.

In the last ten or fifteen years there has been placed a very considerable emphasis upon the teaching of the dull or the backward child, in order that we might bring him up to the standard or the average. I suppose in some cases we have done good, a real service, and in many cases we have only emphasized to those children the fact that they were still failures so far as the standards of the schools were concerned. On the other hand, until quite recently we have entirely taken the superintendent's theory at face value and have paid little attention to the child who had capacity to do superior work. Lately, however, we have placed a considerable emphasis upon the term "bright child;" so much so, in fact, that our bright child has come to look upon himself as one little

girl expressed it to her former superintendent when he went to visit her in her new school. She said, "Mr. B., you know I am the youngest child in this school and I am the brightest."

There is coming a new idea that has been brought through the development of scientific measurement. Yesterday it was only a dream; today it is an experiment and tomorrow we have every reason to believe that it will be a part of our working procedure. We are devising means whereby we can test the ability of a child, the capacity of the child to do certain phases of school work; in the next few years there is every reason to believe that we will perfect this means of measurement until we can know very exactly the capacity of the child to do any particular task or work that the schools have standardized. At the same time we are developing other types of tests that will help us to measure a child's achievement more accurately than we now are measuring, more accurately than we have been able to measure by any previous scheme.

I speak first of all in terms of those tests that are already standardized for the elementary schools and that are being standardized to some extent for the more fundamental subject matter of the secondary schools. The method of the group intelligence and standard educational test may be adapted to any type or grade of work in a way that will measure more accurately than we have ever done before the achievement in any subject that we endeavor to teach.

There will come a time when we shall measure the capacity to learn of every child in the public schools. Perhaps I should say of every student in our schools and colleges; and we shall measure his achievement in terms of his capacity to achieve. That is, if we have a student with an intelligence quotient of 120, another in the same group with an intelligence quotient of 100, and another with an intelligence quotient of 80; and we find when we have measured their achievement in any subject, that the achievement of that one with an intelligence quotient of 100, the average student, expressed as an educational quotient is 100; and that the brighter student with an intelligence quotient of 120 has an educational quotient of 110; and the duller student, the one with the intelligence quotient of 80, has an educational quotient of 90, I wonder to which one we shall give the greatest credit. Will we give it to the one who

has the educational quotient of 110 or will we give the more credit to the one who has the educational quotient of 90? I am inclined to think that we shall come to the place where we will credit a student's achievement in school according to the talents that have been given him. If he has only one talent and has used it wisely and well we will credit him accordingly; if he has ten talents and has developed only five of them we will count him a failure in life. We will count our reward and I say rewards both in the school and in the generation of men and women who pass through such training out into life—in terms of their capacity to achieve. The idea will take on a new meaning in the social structure. We shall think of a man who has capacity to be a great banker or a great lawyer or a great leader of men and is satisfied with being only ordinary as one open to suspicion and distrust. As for the other man who has capacity only to be a laborer or a street-car motorman or a barber or a workman requiring small intelligence, if he does that work well with the proper skill, we shall look upon him with a great deal of pride and will give him a reward socially in measure with his skill and with his efforts.

TEMPORARY COMMITTEES

On Audit.

Professor H. R. Barnes, Franklin and Marshall College; Dean Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College.

On Nominations.

Headmaster Samuel Osbourn, Germantown Academy, Chairman; President J. H. Apple, Hood College; Miss Laura Vail, The Vail-Dean School; President George S. Davis, Hunter College; Principal Lewis R. Harley, Philadelphia High School for Girls.

AFTERNOON SESSION**BUSINESS MEETING.****REPORT OF THE TREASURER.**

For the Year 1920-21, Ending November 23, 1921.

DEBIT.

Balance November 29, 1920	\$407.40
Dues from one institution, 1912-13, 1913-14, 1914-15, at \$5.00	15.00
Dues from one institution, 1916-17, 1917-18, at \$5.00....	10.00
Dues from two institutions, 1918-19, at \$5.00.....	10.00
Dues from eleven institutions, 1919-20, at \$5.00	55.00
Dues from 239 institutions, 1920-21, at \$7.50.....	1,792.50
Dues from three institutions, 1921-22, at \$7.50.....	22.50
Sale of Proceedings	2.00
Interest on Deposits	24.15

\$2,338.55**CREDIT.**

Expenses of Annual Conference 1920	\$204.54
Printing	649.65
Salaries	150.00
Postage, Office Expenses, etc.	146.86
Travel of Officers, Executive Committee and Commis- sions	417.52
Dues of one institution paid twice by mistake	7.50

\$1,576.07

Leaving a balance in the hands of the Treasurer, Novem- ber 23, 1921, of	\$762.48
On deposit with the Girard Trust Company of Philadel- phia	732.48
Two checks not deposited amounting to	30.00

\$762.48

Three institutions are in arrears for the dues of 1919-20 and
1920-21.

Six institutions are in arrears for the dues of 1920-1921 only.

In accordance with the By-Laws of the Association, institutions are automatically dropped from membership because of non-payment of dues for three consecutive years.

This rule applies this year to one institution, the High School for Girls, Reading, Pa., not included in the above statement of schools in arrears.

STANLEY R. YARNALL,
Treasurer.

We have examined the account and accompanying vouchers and find all to be correct as set forth, the balance in the hands of the Treasurer being \$762.48.

HORACE R. BARNES,
RAYMOND WALTERS,
Auditors.

November 25, 1921.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

November 25, 1921.

During the year 1920-21 the following institutions were admitted to membership, having received the approval of the Executive Committee:

Armstrong Manual Training High School, Washington, D. C.

Oak Lane Country Day School, Oak Lane, Pa.

Garrison Forest School, Garrison, Md.

St. Thomas College, Scranton, Pa.

Roger Ascham School, White Plains, N. Y.

The Nichols School, Buffalo, N. Y.

Moorestown Friends' School, Moorestown, N. J.

Moravian College and Theological Seminary having paid up its back dues was restored to membership. The Narberth High School and the New Jersey School for the Deaf resigned, and the Girls' High School at Reading was dropped for non-payment of fees. The total membership at present is 261 institutions distributed as follows:

Universities and Colleges	80
Normal Schools	4
High Schools	54
Private Schools	123

The Committee gave its approval to the personnel of the Commission on Accredited Schools appointed by the retiring President, Mr. Walter Marsh:

Terms Expiring 1922:

Miss Miriam A. Bytel, St. Mary's School; Mr. Samuel M North, Maryland State Department of Education.

Terms Expiring 1923:

President John H. Denbigh, Packer Institute; Professor Radcliffe Heermance, Princeton University.

Terms Expiring 1924:

Headmaster William M. Irvine, Mercersburg Academy; Professor George Gailey Chambers, University of Pennsylvania, *Chairman*.

The President of the Association.

The Secretary of the Association.

The Chairman, Professor G. G. Chambers, subsequently found it necessary to tender his resignation from the Commission, and within the past week Dean G. H. Reavis, of the School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, has consented to take the Chairmanship. The commission has not been able to meet for organization and in consequence will have no report to make at this time.

At the request of the Association of College Presidents of Pennsylvania, a place has been reserved upon the afternoon program for a Committee which desires to present the views of that Association upon the standardization of colleges. For this reason the Executive Committee departed from precedent in arranging the program by confining the discussion of general educational topics to the morning meeting.

The Committee has accepted the cordial invitation from the Trustees and Headmaster of the Tower Hill School, Wilmington, to hold the annual convention of 1922 under its auspices. The resources of the School are ample to provide for the comfortable entertainment of the Association and the affiliated organizations.

GEORGE WM. McCLELLAND,

Secretary.

The following appointments were announced by President Guth:

Representative on National Conference Committee on Standards:

PRESIDENT FREDERICK C. FERRY, Hamilton College.

Representatives on Committee on Uniform Entrance Requirements on English:

PROFESSOR FRANCIS STODDARD, New York University.

PROFESSOR ARTHUR H. QUINN, University of Pennsylvania.

HEADMASTER L. WARDLAW MILES, Gilman Country School.

Representatives on the College Entrance Examination Board:

HEADMASTER WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy.

PRINCIPAL STANLEY R. YARNALL, Germantown Friends' School.

HEADMASTER WALTER R. MARSH, St. Paul's School.

HEADMASTER RICHARD M. GUMMERE, Wm. Penn Charter School.

PRINCIPAL JOHN DENBIGH, Packer Collegiate Institute.

ADDRESSES BY MEMBERS OF A COMMITTEE FROM
THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE PRESIDENTS
OF PENNSYLVANIA ON THE STAND-
ARDIZATION OF UNIVERSITIES
AND COLLEGES.

- I. DR. HENRY S. DRINKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Association of College Presidents of Pennsylvania and President Emeritus of Lehigh University.

I represent the Committee of the Association of College Presidents of Pennsylvania, and we are not here in behalf of any off-hand, hasty consideration of this matter. It has been given careful study by the Association of College Presidents of Pennsylvania for a year past. They took it up first at their meeting at Harrisburg last winter, again at their meeting in the spring, and again at their meeting in August. Understand that all of our committee are also delegate members to this association; so that we are here in a double capacity: as delegate members of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in the Middle States and Maryland, and also as a committee presenting the views of the College Presidents of Pennsylvania on this matter of the standardization of colleges in the Middle States and Maryland.

Now it has seemed to our association that it was questionable whether a question of this great importance should be taken up and decided by an association constituted such as this association is, and we were instructed to come here and present to you the resolution that after careful consideration the Association of College Presidents of this state adopted:

"Resolved, that while the Association of College Presidents of Pennsylvania recognizes the value of the definition of proper and efficient standards to which universities and colleges should attain and conform, we are of the opinion that the publication of any list of so-called accredited universities and colleges is beyond the proper functions of a body such as is constituted by the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in the Middle States and Maryland."

And speaking as members of this Association we would call the attention of our brethren in the Association to Article 7 of the Constitution of this Association which reads:

"Power of the Association. Decisions by the Association of questions not pertaining to its organization shall always be considered *advisory* and not *mandatory*; each institution preserving its own individuality and liberty of action upon all other subjects considered."

The words "*advisory*," and "*mandatory*" are italicised in the Proceedings of this Association for 1920.

Now as you understand of course, the Commission (of this Association) on the Accrediting of Higher Institutions that has been studying this question for some time past, proposes to report a list of colleges that conform to certain propositions that have been enunciated and adopted by this Association, and to exclude from that list those who do not so conform. Now I do not know how it strikes you, but I do not know of any action that could be more mandatory on the colleges of this and the other states concerned, than to say that if they do not do the things that this Association thinks they should do, they are to be excluded from the list of efficient or standard colleges. It seems to me that that is about as mandatory a requirement as possibly could be devised. And therefore it would seem to us and to the Association that I represent here as being in contravention of the above Article 7 of the Constitution.

Now, gentlemen, this committee, in order that you may understand just where we stand, is composed of President Brumbaugh, of Juniata College; President Hixson, of Allegheny; President Morgan, of Dickinson; President Granville, of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg; President Haas, of Muhlenberg; Dean Dunham, of Temple; President Hunt, of Albright; President Warfield, of Wilson College, and President Emeritus Drinker, of Lehigh. And they are here simply to place before you the very emphatic view of the colleges and universities of the State of Pennsylvania, that it is inadvisable for an association constituted such as this, to attempt to lay down standards of this nature; that it is a question involving the chartered rights of the colleges that are now operating in this state, all of whom we have reason to believe are doing their duty or trying to do it, and none of whom have so far been subjected to any legislative criticism, or criticism or action by the constituted authorities of the state by which they were chartered. And it would seem that any standardization or listing of the colleges of this state should be done by some body possessing authority from the legislature, the body which has authorized the existence and work of these colleges of the state. And while we do not as an association oppose any reasonable system of standardization that comes from state authority we doubt exceedingly whether it ought to come from an unincorporated Association such as this to which we all belong, and which is composed of members not only from our state, but of members from other states, who may not be posted as to the rights and the duties of the colleges that have been chartered by Pennsylvania.

And for that reason the resolution that I have read to you was adopted, and we are here now to suggest that it would seem highly advisable that no final action should be taken on the report of the Commission which will report to you here today—a Commission of this Association—until further consideration can be given the matter, and until consultation can be had with the State Council of Education of Pennsylvania, and with similar bodies in the states represented in this Association, and with the Associations of Colleges and Universities of this, and the other state concerned. And therefore we desire to give you the views of the colleges of this state, in all courtesy and as fully as we can, because we should deplore any issue arising between the colleges

and universities of Pennsylvania and this Association. I have no memory in life pleasanter than the visit that this Association made to Lehigh while I was acting as President of that institution. We all have the highest opinion of the work that this Association has accomplished in the past, and believe that it is open to it to accomplish much in the future, and we wish, if possible, to avoid unnecessary friction and disagreement. But in order that the matter may be before you for consideration during this meeting I call your attention to the resolution which before action is taken on the report of the Commission, we propose to offer, formally, to this effect:

"Resolved, that action on the report of the Commission on the Accrediting of Higher Institutions be postponed and the report held unpublished, and that the said Commission be and it is hereby instructed to confer with the Council of Education of the State of Pennsylvania and with the Association of College Presidents of said state and with similar bodies in other states represented in this Association, with a view to the initiation and adoption of some concordant system in regard to the matter of standardization."

I appeal to you, the members of this Association, to remember that the publication of any list of accredited colleges omitting certain colleges of the state will inflict not a slight injury, but an absolutely irreparable injury on the colleges so omitted; and you ought to be very careful how you undertake to publish any such list; it is not sufficient to say that colleges so omitted can by subsequent action increase their endowments to the extent that this Association thinks advisable, or their faculties to the number designated. Once listed as inefficient, it will be practically impossible to undo the harm that has been done. And we urge upon you careful work in this matter, proper consideration, and full consideration by all persons interested.

It is proposed, Mr. Chairman, that I shall be followed in this presentation by a representative of one,—I speak advisedly—of one of the best colleges in our state, the Moravian College and Theological Seminary at Bethlehem, of which I have had intimate personal knowledge for many years, and which is one of the colleges which is threatened with possible exclusion from a standardized list. It is highly advisable that we should hear from Dr. Rau, Dean of that college, who takes the place of President Haas,

President of the Association of College Presidents of Pennsylvania and President of Muhlenberg College, who cannot be here today and who was to follow me in this presentation.

2. DR. ALBERT G. RAU, Dean of the Moravian College and Theological Seminary.

It seems a little odd to appear before a body such as this to defend an institution that was founded in 1807, the second oldest college in the State of Pennsylvania. An institution which in that time has never ceased to do the little bit of work that it proposed to do; which has never ceased to have sufficient money to pay its bills at the end of every year; has never had a deficit and has increased its endowment as time went on to cover the additional expenses that were needed to cover the additional cost.

This little college was founded for purposes within a communion of which probably most of you have never heard. There are only twenty thousand Moravians, less than twenty thousand Moravians, in the United States. They wanted an institution for themselves in which they could educate their young men. They established it. They endowed it. They have paid for it year by year and continue to do so. It was founded for the purpose of giving a liberal education, and the nature of that education was rather closely laid down at that time. As years went on it was broadened to suit the demands of the times. But certain elements of the curriculum that were laid down in the beginning were never lost sight of, and that which was added to the curriculum was only that much as was needed for the purpose of broadening the lives of the young men in its care. As a consequence it was necessary to narrow down the scope of the institution.

We take eighty young men; we usually have them, too, and that is all we want, just eighty. Now the fact that we are a miniature college I presume has nothing to do with the case. And yet there is high merit in a miniature sometimes. The fact that we are a miniature college makes our endowment, which I contend is large enough for our purposes (and it is indeed the interest on \$500,000), larger per student, probably, than the endowment of many another large institution. Our requirements from the point of view of professorships are not large. Consequently we have not

a great many teachers; but we have as many as are demanded by the categories that are laid down by this Association.

For years we have added to our student body of those who were preparing for work in our own church about fifty per cent. more of young men who are sent to us because the institution commends itself to the minds of some fathers and mothers of young men. I cannot go into the details, but there have been turned out from this institution, in the last fifty years, eleven college presidents, out of a total attendance each year of eighty or less. Dr. Emil de Schweinitz, late Dean of the George Washington University, was a graduate of Moravian College and of no other. Dr. George E. de Schweinitz, of Philadelphia, the noted oculist, is a graduate of Moravian College. The Hon. James M. Beck, the Solicitor General of the United States, is a graduate of Moravian College. Dr. William Hamilton, of the Federal Educational Department, in charge of education of native peoples in Alaska, is a graduate of Moravian College. Dr. William J. Holland, late of the University of Pittsburgh, now of the Carnegie Museum, is a graduate of Moravian College. Dr. William F. Bade, President pro tem. of the University of California, is likewise a graduate of Moravian College.

Now the contention that we make is this: that if you build by categories, on which you are going to judge people, the categories must be completely inclusive; and when you come to a special case you must break down your categories or break your soul, one or the other.

If, as has been contended before the committee—that need not be gone over here now—in every detail this institution fulfils the demands of those categories, then for one I do not want my institution put on any second list, nor would you.

What will happen? For over fifty years our graduates have gone out into the post-graduate work of large institutions. We have them today in Harvard Law School, Harvard Medical School, University of Pennsylvania, right here in Philadelphia. I have no doubt that Pennsylvania would continue to accept our work; I do not doubt it in the least. But last year we certified two men to Wisconsin and two men to Michigan. Let us assume that some of our friends in the West get hold of a report from this Association so defining Moravian College. Whatever may

have been the success of the young men whom we have sent before, we are thrown on the defensive by action which precludes any reply on our part.

Now I am a member of the Association and have a right to talk to my "own folks" in this way. I cannot go back on this Association, and yet I have no means of getting hold, for our institution, of anything that will justify us in the sight of the world. And in the meantime I contend that we have met the requirements that are laid down and that fundamentally the objection is in the interpretation.

I presume that it might be possible for the little group that guards St. Peter's gate to get together and determine that a mechanist scheme of categories for admission through the pearly doors would be better than personal examination of fitness. Let us assume that having planned and adopted these standards, the committee adjourns, leaving the gate in the hands of a single guardian. In succession there are admitted a prince of the church, a prince of the realm, and a prince of business. And then appear at the door two—a humble school teacher from the red building, and a railsplitter from Illinois. I wonder whether St. Peter would break his conscience or his categories?

This is the way I feel about the matter of the standardization that ought to be carried out by this Association. And if anything is going to be done to standardize the colleges of the State of Pennsylvania, an institution that for nearly one hundred and twenty-five years has carried on a life of consistent humanist development will be willing to step into line with any one, at the front or at the end. But I think the movement should come out of the regular forces that control the educational fortunes of the state. May I not appeal to you to consider this matter from the point of view that I have laid before you?

3. PRESIDENT ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD, Wilson College.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: When I came to the door of the hall this morning the Chairman of the Commission, as I offered him my hand, said, "Do we still shake hands?" I am afraid I have said some things in the course of the arguments which have taken place in connection with this subject which may have been expressed with more asperity than I desired. Yet this

is one of those questions in which men must differ, and in differing may well retain their friendship one with another. It is by the hammers of thought on the anvils of time that the great progress of the world is beaten out, and neither you nor I desire that the decision of this body shall be a haphazard decision, one which shall be taken today and rescinded tomorrow. I would like especially to call your attention to the fact that the American Council of Education has recently had a meeting at which was considered the question of standardization throughout the country, and an effort made to reconcile the differences between the different sections. It is reported to me that the basis of standardization is quite different from that contained in this proposed report.

I speak with diffidence on this subject, because I have been refused by the Council on Education a sight of the report. I have been informed somewhat as to its contents by members of our Commission and a member of the National Board. This Commission, I understand, was represented in that meeting, and I think we are entitled to all the information that belongs to any Commission appointed by this body.

The origin of this Association is clear in my memory, and particularly the reorganization, which was referred to this morning, under the prompting of Dr. McGill, of this college. I remember the letter which he wrote to me at Lafayette College, inviting me to join a number of others in reorganizing the old association. As a result it was put on its present basis, which has been so fruitful and so helpful to the great purpose which was so near to Dr. McGill's heart. It was filled with the spirit of cooperation and confidence and helpfulness which heretofore has been represented in this Association. It considered a college a thing to be cultivated and encouraged, to be promoted in its endeavors, to be helped over its difficulties. And he realized that such help was not merely a benefit to the college itself but that it enabled it better to serve the country.

Still more Dr. McGill's heart was open and warm to that thing which moves me most in all my thought as an educator. Beautiful for situation, crowned with glorious structures, adorned by earnest scholars, as many of our colleges are; the thing which makes them dear to those who know what true education is, is the army of boys and girls with a vision of life in their hearts who

come up to these colleges. Many are only country colleges supported by little communities, but they love learning and they know the worth of the soul of man and of minds disciplined and instructed in the things that make life here worth while and make a life beyond certain. I plead with you today to do nothing to put a stumbling block in the way of any of the least of these boys and girls.

The new President of the State College of Pennsylvania, speaking to the Federation of Women's Clubs in Pittsburgh recently, said that there were seven colleges for women in Pennsylvania and one of those colleges had an endowment of two million and a quarter and the other six divided a quarter of a million among them. That is the sum of the history of Pennsylvania colleges for women as it was at the last report of the Commission of Education. Bryn Mawr College now has four and a half millions; Wilson College can wipe out all the balance and have something left. Other colleges are pressing on. Some are in the midst of campaigns for funds.

Immediate insistence on the requirement of \$500,000 endowment in invested funds above all indebtedness will close the door that stands open today before women's colleges of Pennsylvania. It will mean much to some of the alumnae who are seeking certificates to teach school; it will mean much to some of those who have invested their lives in promoting these colleges. It will not spare them that you say that the door will be shut today but may swing open tomorrow. They have vested rights. Rights vested in something more than a mere legal claim. Rights in the fair domain which has been won by the zeal and faith and fealty of this association, with its long history. You have no more right to print a list of colleges based on money values and send it out as including all the standard colleges in Pennsylvania than you have to break faith with the boys, the nameless heroes, who gave their lives in France.

What is a college? What is a state? When we were talking about the concert of nations, the balance of power and all such things, none invited Belgium into the conferences. But when the hour struck when the world needed to know that honor and integrity were the true marks of a nation, little Belgium stopped the way. If little Belgium had not stopped the way and proved

that it is not in material resources but in spiritual realities that great nations persist, we should have been too late to vindicate righteousness and win peace for democracy and the world.

Whatever I may have to say for Wilson I would say a thousandfold for that little Moravian College whose simple record has been laid before you today. We will not endure the brand of a second rate college. It is a shame that I am sure you will not, out of the generosity of your heart, put upon any of these colleges. I have been told when I have pleaded that it is brains and character, scholarship and devotion to truth, that make a college, that it is hard to standardize along such lines. Why, yes, it is hard to standardize along such lines. Such things refuse to be kept in bonds. If I were an extreme evolutionist I would say that the greatest monkey that ever was, was the monkey that reached up and broke away from the standardizing processes and resolved to be a man.

There is something subtler and more gracious in the purpose to be free to grow than any standardization plan can ever measure. It is the college spirit. We have it in Wilson College. It embraces the gracious womanhood, the fine intelligence, that I meet every morning in the chapel at Wilson College. You say they are college girls. I say no, they are the heirs of eternity, the hopes of a thousand homes, the joy and the delight of the men who love the things that are most lovely. And these things demand and require to be valued and measured by intellectual and spiritual standards. They cannot be estimated in terms of invested funds. Will you put any discouragement in the way of those who are leading them into the light which they are striving to reach?

Are we really come to an age in which every measure must be a material measure? When we expect to take to the laboratory our love and our faith and value them there?

I appeal to you to exercise a little patience,—not in listening a second time to me while I plead for intellectual and spiritual things rather than material values in education,—for a little of the flexibility of mind which Dr. Ferry so beautifully presented to us this morning; but a little patience in deciding whether a great army of alumnae shall find its Thanksgiving season a season of darkness and shadow from which they will not easily emerge. A year is not long in the history of institutions.

The path of progress cannot be completely traced by any mechanical instruments or a mechanistic estimate of the universe. I was astonished, Mr. President, when Dr. Ferry said this morning that analytical geometry is a dry subject. The great German Kant said, "There are two things that always fill me with emotion: the nightly stars in the heavens and the moral law in the heart of man." I should have been ashamed if I had not delighted in my college days to work out equations of ellipse and parabola that enabled me to trace through the nightly heavens the path of those eternal stars.

And it is the same with other things. It is not through wealth alone but wealth put to work that colleges grow strong. It is not for us to dictate whether wealth shall be put to work in investments in bonds and stocks or in building better buildings and in buying larger estates, when the opportunity serves, for realization in the future.

Mr. President, I beg your pardon for trespassing upon the time. This is one of those things that move me so deeply that I cannot but sometimes exceed the ordinary limits that I would put upon myself. I thank you.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

PROFESSOR ADAMS LEROY JONES, Chairman.

I think this assembly owes to the Commission on the Accrediting of Higher Institutions a debt of gratitude, quite apart from any service which it may have done by its labors during the past few years, and that is to have been the occasion of the eloquent addresses to which we have just been listening.

In this report and in the membership of the committee so far as I am aware we cannot attempt in any way to present anything in competition with the eloquence and moving sentences to which we have listened.

It may be in order perhaps for me to make a few preliminary remarks before presenting the report, if I may, just touching upon one or two matters which have recently been mentioned.

The Commission would be sorry, if the members of this assembly were to leave this hall with the impression that the only

standard adopted by the Association was to the effect that the college to be placed upon the list must have \$500,000 of debt-free productive endowment. That is mentioned as one of the standards. As you are all aware from the standards which are printed in the 1919 report of the Association, it is stated that it is only one of the standards, that no college will at present be left off the list if in all other particulars it meets the standards adopted by the Association.

There are a number of other points which have been brought forward which seem to me to call for discussion, but I am not going to attempt to cover all the ground. I should, however, like to say a word or two further about the history of the body which I am representing here this afternoon.

In 1917, as you will all find by referring to the minutes of this Association, a resolution was adopted under which a committee was appointed to consider the question of the establishment of some sort of agency for making a list of colleges within the territory of this Association which might be found to meet standards approved by the Association. It was pointed out at that time that that was an undertaking not new by any means; that it had been carried on for a number of years by the North Central Association, a body whose territory extends from Ohio on the east to Montana on the west and from Canada to Texas; that that Commission had been at work for a number of years, that certain standards had been adopted and had been applied by the Commission; and that something of the same sort had been adopted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, whose requirements for membership were such as to make the membership of that body a classified list of colleges.

It was pointed out also that there had been other agencies interested in this matter, that the Association of American Universities had a list covering the country as a whole, but that that was incomplete, and that there were constant requests from colleges and universities through the country addressed to the colleges and universities within the territory of this Association; that as a matter of fact there were a number of certain rough classifications already in existence, but nothing which was based upon a careful or thorough-going study.

The committee reported in 1918 at a meeting held in Prince-

ton and it was instructed to draw up a definition and standards and a plan for the Commission. It was provided, as you will find in the printed report of the meeting of that year, that if favorable action was taken the Association would give to the Commission which was to be appointed its hearty and full support.

In 1919, at the meeting in Philadelphia, this committee reported definitions and standards and also reported a method by which a Commission could be organized. There was considerable discussion at that meeting. No serious objections were offered from any point. The definition and standards were adopted. A Commission was provided and was instructed to proceed with its work. It was the third year in succession in which the matter had been up for discussion.

Shortly after the occurrence of that meeting the Commission was appointed in accordance with the action taken by the Association at that time. It held a number of meetings in the course of the year and while it had not been able to obtain information from or about all the colleges within the territory of the Association, it had received information from a considerable number of them, and it was ready at that time to offer a preliminary report, just as a preliminary report that a certain group of colleges complied with the standards.

At the very urgent solicitation of a gentleman who is the president of a college and a friend of many members of the Commission, the Commission at the last moment consented to postpone its report for that year. Since the meeting a year ago the Commission has held five meetings: the first in Baltimore immediately following the meeting of this Association last year; the second in Philadelphia, in the month of December; the third in New York, a two-day session, in the month of January; the fourth in June, again in New York; and the last in Philadelphia, in October. The Commission has worked to the very best of its ability and you will see that it has not cut short its time.

As a matter of fact, one of the members of the Commission at the meeting in New York in June protested finally that the meetings were called to order on daylight saving time and dismissed on Eastern Standard time.

Now it should be remembered in regard to this that no college was required to do anything. Colleges were invited to supply

information. As a result of the suggestion of the President of one of the colleges made last year in a conference of the Commission, arrangements were made by which visits could be made to colleges which so desired by a person appointed by the Commission with the approval of one of the great educational foundations, which as a matter of fact supplied the necessary funds. It was interested in it as an educational undertaking, but it was not otherwise interested.

There are a number of colleges within the territory of the Association which have not cared to send in any information to the Commission. The fact that a college does not appear upon the list of those which, to the best knowledge and judgment of the Commission, comply with the definition and standards, the fact that it does not appear on that list does not necessarily give any information about it. What we have set out to do is to give information about certain colleges which we find do, to the best of our knowledge and belief, comply with the definition and standards laid down by the Association. The fact that a college is not there may mean simply that it has not seen fit to send in any information or to make any application for inclusion.

In the earlier pages of this report, there is included a statement of the standards of the Association; but as it is to be presumed that all members of the Association are more or less familiar with this or can at any rate refresh their memories by turning to the report of 1919, I will, unless there is request to the contrary, omit the reading of the definition and standards.

The duties of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education as stated in the resolutions under which it was established are as follows:

1. To recommend from time to time such changes in the stated standards for institutions of higher education as may be desirable, especially such as may be in the direction of uniformity with those of other standardizing agencies.

2. To adopt from time to time lists of accepted institutions of higher learning in accordance with the standards adopted by this Association.

Acting under those instructions the Commission, after careful examination and consideration of the facts, after these visits of inspection to colleges requesting inspection, and after confer-

ences with representatives of colleges requesting conferences it has adopted the following list of institutions for the year 1920-1921 and has found that the colleges in the list comply with the definition and standards announced by the Association in each case.

I must add one exception there: that a request from one college came in so late that it was not possible to have a visit made. That college was a college of Western Maryland. While we had information from other sources and information sent us directly it was not possible to have that visit made. Colleges of liberal arts and sciences but not technical schools are covered in the list.

I have then next to present the list of colleges. Now I should like to make sure, if I may, Mr. Chairman, whether there is any objection to my proceeding with this report at this time. I want to make sure that there is no misunderstanding here; that we are not proceeding in any way which would be regarded by the representatives of the Association of Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania as in any way unfair.

It was moved by Ex-President Drinker and seconded by Provost Penniman, University of Pennsylvania, that the list of the approved colleges be not read or published until after some definite action had been taken upon the report of the Commission. A long and earnest discussion on the motion followed. Some of the most important points are here reproduced in summary.

President H. H. Apple, Franklin and Marshall College, laid emphasis upon the purpose that led to the organization of the Association, that of encouraging and strengthening the development of the colleges and schools within the territory, and expressed his conviction that the omission of a college from the published list would work great and lasting injury to that college's development.

On the other hand, President Boothe Davis, Alfred University, urging that the Commission be allowed to present its full report, voiced the opinion that nothing finer could happen to an ambitious college that did not quite measure up to the standards than to have its alumni and trustees feel that with a little additional effort it could become an institution approved by real progressive

educational standards. This opinion was endorsed by President C. P. McClelland, Drew Seminary, and other speakers.

President G. L. Omwake, Ursinus College, stated that in his opinion there should be some standardizing agency, but that the publication of the Commission's list of approved colleges at present would create prejudices that would interfere with the plans that had been made to build up some of the smaller colleges.

The benefits that had come to education in the South through the activities of the Southern Commission on Accrediting Schools were pointed out by Dean J. H. Latané, Johns Hopkins University, who expressed the belief that a satisfactory list of colleges could never be obtained from the state bodies.

Professor French, Johns Hopkins University, questioned the propriety of refusing to receive the full report of a Commission that had been working for years under the direction of the Association and upon the basis of standards which that Association had adopted.

Speaking as a member of the Commission, Mr. Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy, stressed the following points:

1. That the report of the Commission was advisory and not mandatory, being merely a piece of advice to universities and professional schools.

2. That such an authoritative list was needed by the professional schools of the entire country and that the publication of this approved list would be a distinct help to many worthy colleges in Pennsylvania that had been omitted from other lists already in existence.

3. That the Commission had been conspicuously broad-minded, fair-minded, and earnest in its work and that no institution had been excluded from the list for strictly technical reasons. The work had been done with greater thoroughness than similar work by other educational bodies. The services of a competent educational expert had been placed at the disposal of the Commission by one of the great educational foundations. This expert had made personal inspection of the colleges that requested such investigation, and had presented data to the members of the Commission for their consideration. It was only when an institution had been found by the Commission either to lack an appreciation

of proper educational standards or to lack the resources to carry out these standards that its name had been omitted from the list.

4. That the Association would be in an unfortunate position if it became known in the educational world that out of consideration for the feelings of institutions that could not reach the accepted standards it suppressed the report of a Commission that had done its work earnestly and thoroughly.

The right of the boy or girl about to enter college to know whether or not a given college could offer a degree that would be universally recognized as first class, was presented by Professor Edgar Dawson, Hunter College. He felt that to fail to receive the full report of the Commission would be to fail to support the interests of sound education.

President Warfield, Wilson College, plead that more time be granted the colleges to reach the standards before the list should be given out, so that there might be no resultant feelings of heart-burnings or bitterness.

A substitute motion was offered by President J. H. Apple, of Hood College, and seconded by Ex-President Drinker to the effect that "The report be re-committed to the Commission to be re-submitted to the Association a year hence, during which time all institutions so desiring shall have an opportunity to appear before the Commission." This motion was ruled out of order as not being germane to the original motion.

The original motion that the list be not read was put by the Chair and defeated; Ayes, 62; Noes, 73. The Chairman of the Commission then completed the reading of the report.

LIST OF APPROVED COLLEGES

Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y.
Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
Augustinian College of Villanova, Villanova, Pa.
Barnard College, New York City.
Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Bucknell University, Lewiston, Pa.
Canisius College, Canisius, N. Y.
Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.
The College of Mount Saint Vincent-on-Hudson, New York.
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, N. Y.

College of Saint Elizabeth, Convent, New Jersey.
College of the City of New York, New York City.
Columbia University, New York City.
Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.
Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.
Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y.
Fordham University, New York City.
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.
Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
Howard University, Washington, D. C.
Hunter College, New York City.
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pa.
Manhattan College, New York City.
Marywood College, Scranton, Pa.
Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.
College of Arts and Pure Science, New York University, New York City.
Pennsylvania College of Gettysburg, Gettysburg, Pa.
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
St. John's College, Brooklyn, N. Y.
St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y.
St. Vincent College, Beatty, Pa.
Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa.
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.
Trinity College, Washington, D. C.
Union University, Schenectady, N. Y.
The University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.
University of Maryland, College Park, Md.
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.
Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.
Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.
Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.
William Smith College, Geneva, N. Y.

Certain other colleges cannot at present be placed upon the approved list because they do not fully meet the definition and standards, but they nevertheless approximate them closely, or have recently made marked progress toward meeting them. The Commission cites in this report the following in this group:

Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.
 Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.
 Hood College, Frederick, Md.
 Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa.
 Lincoln University, Lincoln University, Pa.
 Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pa.
 Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md.
 Saint Bonaventure's College, Allegany, N. Y.
 Saint Stephen's College, Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y.
 Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.
 Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.

It is suggested that students from these colleges applying for admission to other institutions of higher education receive generous treatment on the basis of their individual merits.

The Commission desires to express its cordial interest in the efforts of all institutions of higher education to improve the quality of their work and has endeavored in all of its deliberations to promote educational progress.

Ex-President Drinker submitted for action the following resolution from the College Presidents of Pennsylvania:

"RESOLVED, THAT action on the report of the Commission on the Accrediting of Higher Institutions be postponed and the report held unpublished, and that the said Commission be and it is instructed to confer with the Council of Education of the State of Pennsylvania and with the Association of College Presidents of said state and with similar bodies in other states represented in this Association, with a view to the initiation and adoption of some concordant system in regard to the matter of standardization."

After some discussion the vote was taken and the resolution defeated. It was then moved by Dean Howard McClenahan, Princeton University, seconded, and carried, that the report of the Commission be adopted and published.

Upon motion of Dean Latané, the Association voted unanimously to express to the President, Trustees and Faculty of Swarthmore College its very deep appreciation of the cordiality and hospitality extended by the college.

LIST OF MEMBERS, 1921-1922

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Adelphi Academy.....	Brooklyn, New York..	Eugene C. Alder
Adelphi College.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Clif- ton Pl. & Lafay- ette Ave.).....	Frank D. Blodgett
Agnes Irwin School.....	Philadelphia (2011 De- lancey Pl.).....	Josephine A. Natt
Albany Academy.....	Albany, N. Y.....	Islay F. McCormick
Albright College.....	Myerstown, Pa.....	L. Clarence Hunt
Alcuin Preparatory School.....	New York City (11½ West 86th Street)...	Grace H. Kupfer and Blanche Hirsch
Alfred University.....	Alfred, N. Y.....	Boothe C. Davis, Ph. D.
Allegheny College.....	Meadville, Pa.....	Fred W. Hixson, D. D., LL. D.
Allentown Preparatory School...	Allentown, Pa.....	Frank G. Sigman
Armstrong Manual Training School.....	Washington, D. C.....	Arthur C. Neuman
Arnold School.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.....	Charles W. Wilder
Baldwin School.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	Elizabeth F. Johnson
Baltimore City College.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Wilbur F. Smith
Baltimore Polytechnic Institute.	Baltimore, Md. (311 Courtland St.).....	William R. King, U. S. N.
Barnard School for Boys.....	New York City (721 St. Nicholas Ave.)..	William L. Hazen
Barnard School for Girls.....	New York City (421 W. 148th St.).....	Wayland E. Stearns
Barringer High School.....	Newark, N. J.....	Lucie Beard
Beard School.....	Orange, N. J.....	May F. Bennett
Bennett School.....	Millbrook, N. Y.....	Ina C. Atwood
Berkeley Institute.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Lincoln Place).....	Lewis Dwight Ray, Ph. D.
Berkeley Irving School.....	New York City (309 W. 83d St.).....	D. Fred Aungst
Bernardsville High School.....	Bernardsville, N. J.....	John M. Tuggey
Bethlehem Preparatory School..	Bethlehem, Pa.....	A. R. Grier
Birmingham School for Girls...	Birmingham, Pa.....	John C. Sharpe
Blair Academy.....	Blairstown, N. J.....	Col. Thompson D. Landon
Bordentown Military Institute..	Bordentown, N. J.....	Arthur L. Jones
Boys' High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	John H. Frizzell
Boys' High School.....	Reading, Pa.....	George N. Northrop
Brearley School.....	New York City (60 East 61st St.).....	M. Carey Thomas, Ph. D., LL. D.
Bryn Mawr College.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	Edith Hamilton
Bryn Mawr School.....	Baltimore, Md. (Cath- edral & Preston Sts.).....	John H. Harris, D. D.
Bucknell University.....	Lewisburg, Pa.....	L. Gertrude Angell
Buffalo Seminary.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	Milo F. McDonald
Bushwick High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (400 Irving Ave.).....	Clara S. Burrough
Camden High School.....	Camden, N. J.....	Rev. M. J. Ahern, S. J.
Canisius College.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	A. M. Drummond
Cascadilla School.....	Ithaca, N. Y.....	C. E. Mason (Miss)
Castle (The).....	Tarrytown, N. Y.....	Miriam A. Bytel
Cathedral School of St. Mary...	Garden City, N. Y.....	Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.
Catholic University of America..	Washington, D. C.....	Dr. Robert J. Trevorrow
Centenary Collegiate Institute..	Hackettstown, N. J...	William Wiener
Central Commercial & Manual Training High School.....	Newark, N. J.....	Walter E. Severance
Central High School.....	Harrisburg, Pa.....	

*Members are requested to send the Secretary notice of any changes to be made in this list. The only degrees printed are those of the doctorate, in order to insure correct addressing.

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Central High School.....	Philadelphia (Broad & Green Sts.)....	John L. Haney, Ph. D.
(Miss) Chandor's School.....	New York City.....	Valentine Chandor
(Miss) Chapin's School.....	New York City (32 E. 57th St.).....	M. C. Fairfax
Chester High School.....	Chester, Pa.....	G. W. Gulden
Chestnut Hill Academy.....	Chestnut Hill, Pa.....	James L. Patterson
Colgate University.....	Hamilton, N. Y.....	Elmer Burritt Bryan, LL. D.
College for Women.....	Allentown, Pa.....	William F. Curtis
College of the City of New York.....	New York City.....	Sydney Edward Mezes, Ph. D., LL. D.
College of New Rochelle.....	New Rochelle, N. Y.....	Rev. Mother Ignatius
College of Saint Elizabeth.....	Convent, N. J.....	Sister Mary Pauline
Collegiate School.....	New York City (241 W. 77th St.).....	Arthur F. Warren
Columbia Grammar School.....	New York City (34-36 E. 51st St.).....	Benjamin Howell Campbell
Columbia High School.....	Columbia, Pa.....	Mary Y. Welsh
Columbia University.....	New York City.....	Nicholas Murray Butler, LL. D.
Cornell University.....	Ithaca, N. Y.....	Livingston Farrand
Cutler School.....	New York City (755 Madison Ave.).....	Henry L. Harrison
Dearborn-Morgan School.....	Orange, N. J.....	A. M. Aroline
Delaware College.....	Newark, Del.....	Walter Hulihan, Ph. D.
DeWitt Clinton High School....	New York City (59th St. & 10th Ave.)....	Francis H. J. Paul
Dickinson College.....	Carlisle, Pa.....	James H. Morgan, Ph. D.
Dickinson Seminary.....	Williamsport, Pa.....	Edith C. Hartman
(Mrs.) Dow's School.....	Briarcliff Manor, N.Y.	Rev. Clarence P. McClelland
Drew Seminary.....	Carmel, N. Y.....	Sister Verecunda
Drexel Institute.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Mr. Wilkinson
D'Youville College.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	
Dunbar High School.....	Washington, D. C.....	
East High School.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	William Betz
Eastern District High School...	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Murray Ave. & Keep St.)	William T. Vlymen, Ph. D.
Eastern High School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	E. J. Becker, Ph. D.
Easton High School.....	Easton, Pa.....	W. C. Davis
East Orange High School.....	East Orange, N. J.....	Ralph E. Files
Elizabethtown College.....	Elizabethtown, Pa.....	J. G. Meyer
Emma Willard School.....	Troy, N. Y.....	Eliza Kellas, Ph. D.
Episcopal Academy.....	Overbrook, Pa.....	Greville Haslam
Erasmus Hall High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	J. H. Low
Ethical Culture School.....	New York City (Central Park West & 63d St.).....	Franklin C. Lewis
Evander Childs High School....	New York City (Westchester & St. Lawrence Ave.).....	Gilbert S. Blakely
Franklin & Marshall Academy..	Lancaster, Pa.....	E. M. Hartman
Franklin & Marshall College....	Lancaster, Pa.....	Henry Harbaugh Apple, D. D., LL. D.
Franklin School.....	New York City (18-20 W. 89th St.)....	Friedrich Otto Koenig, J. N. D.
Friends' Central High School...	Philadelphia, Pa.(15th & Race Sts.).....	Charles B. Walsh
Friends' School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	E. C. Wilson
Friends' School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (112 Schermerhorn St.)...	Guy W. Chipman
Friends' School.....	Wilmington, Del.....	Herschel A. Norris
Friends' Select School.....	Philadelphia, Pa. (140 N. 16th St.).....	Walter W. Haviland

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Friends' Seminary.....	New York City (226 E. 16th St.).....	John L. Carver
Gallaudet College.....	Washington, D. C.....	Percival Hall
Garrison Forest School.....	Green Spring Valley, Garrison, Md.....	
Geneva College.....	Beaver Falls, Pa.....	Dr. R. H. Martin
George School.....	George School, Pa.....	George A. Walton
Georgetown College.....	Washington, D. C.....	Rev. A. J. Donlon
George Washington University..	Washington, D. C.....	Charles H. Stockton, LL. D.
Germantown Academy.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Samuel E. Osbourne
Germantown Friends' School....	Germantown, Phila....	Stanley R. Yarnall
Germantown High School.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Harry F. Keller, Ph. D., Sc. D.
Gettysburg College.....	Gettysburg, Pa.....	W. A. Granville
Gilman Country School.....	Roland Park, Md.....	L. Wardlaw Miles
Girls' High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	W. F. Felter, Ph. D.
Girls' High School.....	Philadelphia, Pa. (17th & Spring Garden St.)	Louis R. Harley, Ph. D.
Goucher College.....	Baltimore, Md.....	William Wesley Guth, Ph. D.
Grove City College.....	Grove City, Pa.....	Weir C. Ketler
Gunston Hall.....	Washington, D. C. (1906 Florida Ave.)	Mrs. Beverly R. Mason
Hackensack High School.....	Hackensack, N. J.....	George L. Bennett
Halstead School.....	Yonkers, N. Y.....	Mary S. Jenkins
Hamilton College.....	Clinton, N. Y.....	Frederick C. Ferry, Ph. D.
Haverford College.....	Haverford, Pa.....	William W. Comfort, Ph. D.
Haverford School.....	Haverford, Pa.....	E. M. Wilson
Highland Hall.....	Hollidaysburg, Pa.....	Ellen C. Keates
Hill School.....	Pottstown, Pa.....	Dwight R. Meigs
(Miss) Hill's School for Girls ..	Philadelphia, Pa. (1808 Spruce St.).....	Lillian C. Jones and Agnes B. Austin
Hobart College.....	Geneva, N. Y.....	Lyman P. Powell
Holman School for Girls.....	Philadelphia, Pa. (2204 Walnut St.).....	Elizabeth W. Braley
Holton Arms School.....	Washington, D. C. (2125 S St.).....	Mrs. Jessie M. Holton
Hood College.....	Frederick, Md.....	Joseph H. Apple, Ph. D.
Horace Mann School for Boys..	Fieldston, New York City (W. 246th St.)	Charles C. Tillinghast
Horace Mann School.....	New York City (120th St. & Broadway)..	Henry C. Pearson
Howard University.....	Washington, D. C.....	Stephen M. Newman
Hunter College of the City of N. Y.....	New York City (Park Ave. & 68th St.)..	George S. Davis, Ph. D.
Jacobi School.....	New York City (158 W. 80th St.).....	Mary E. Calhoun
Jamaica High School.....	Jamaica, New York City.....	Charles H. Vosburgh
Johns Hopkins University.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Frank J. Goodnow, LL. D.
Juniata College.....	Huntingdon, Pa.....	I. Harvey Brumbaugh, Ph. D.
Kensington High School for Girls.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Beulah Fenimore
Kent Place School.....	Summit, N. J.....	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul
Kiskiminetas Springs School....	Saltsburg, Pa.....	A. W. Wilson
Lafayette College.....	Easton, Pa.....	John Henry MacCracken, Ph. D., LL. D.
La Salle College.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Rev. Brother Richard
Lawrenceville School.....	Lawrenceville, N. J....	Walter A. Abbott
Lebanon Valley College.....	Annaville, Pa.....	G. D. Gossard, D. D.

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Lehigh University.....	S. Bethlehem, Pa.....	
Lincoln University.....	Lincoln University, Pa.....	Rev. John B. Randall
Linden Hall Seminary.....	Lititz, Pa.....	Rev. F. W. Stengel
Lock Haven High School.....	Lock Haven, Pa.....	C. W. Hunt
Loyola College.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Rev. Joseph A. McEueany, S. J.
Loyola School.....	New York City (65 E. 83rd St.).....	J. Havens Richards, S. J.
McDonogh School.....	McDonogh, Md.....	M. H. Bowman, Jr.
Mackenzie School.....	Monroe, N. Y.....	Rev. Jas. C. Mackenzie, Ph. D.
(Miss)Madeira's School.....	Washington, D. C. (1326 19th St.).....	Lucy Madeira Wing
Maher Preparatory School.....	Philadelphia, Pa. (115 S. 34th St.).....	John F. Maher
Manhattan College.....	New York City (3280 Broadway).....	Brother Edward, F. S. C.
Manual Training High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	Horace M. Snyder, Ph. D.
Maryland State Normal School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Henry S. West
Mary Lyon School.....	Swarthmore, Pa.....	H. M. Crist
Marywood College.....	Scranton, Pa.....	Mother M. Casimir
Massee Country School.....	Bronxville, N. Y.....	Dr. W. W. Massee
(Misses) Masters' School.....	Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.....	
Mercersburg Academy.....	Mercersburg, Pa.....	William Mann Irvine, Ph. D.
Milne High School.....	Albany, N. Y.....	John M. Sayles
Mohegan Lake School.....	Mohegan, N. Y.....	Albert E. Linder
Montclair Academy.....	Montclair, N. J.....	John G. MacVicar
Montclair High School.....	Montclair, N. J.....	H. W. Dutch
Moorestown Friends' School.....	Moorestown, N. J.....	
Moravian College and Theo- logical Seminary.....	Bethlehem, Pa.....	Rev. A. Schultze, D. D.
Moravian Seminary and College for Women.....	Bethlehem, Pa.....	Rev. J. H. Clewell
Morris High School.....	New York City (Bos- ton Rd. & 166th St.).....	Elmer E. Bogart
Morristown School.....	Morristown, N. J.....	Arthur P. Butler
Mount St. Agnes College.....	Mt. Washington, Md.....	Sister M. Carmelita
Mount Vernon Seminary.....	Washington, D. C.....	(Miss) Adelia G. Hensley
Muhlenburg College.....	Allentown, Pa.....	John A. W. Haas, D. D., LL. D.
Nazareth Hall Military Academy	Nazareth, Pa.....	Rev. A. D. Thaeler
Newark Academy.....	Newark, N. J.....	Wilson Farrand
New Jersey State Normal School	Trenton, N. J.....	J. J. Savitz
New York Military Academy...	Cornwall-on-Hudson, N. Y.....	Sebastian C. Jones
New York State College for Teachers.....	Albany, N. Y.....	Abraham R. Brubacker
New York University.....	New York City.....	Elmer Ellsworth Brown, Ph. D., LL. D.
Nicholas School.....	Buffalo, N. Y. (Am- herst & Colvin Sts.).....	Walter D. Head
Northeast High School for Boys.	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Dr. George F. Stradling
Oak Lane Country Day School..	Oak Lane, Pa.....	Francis M. Froelicher
Packer Collegiate Institute.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	John H. Denbigh, Ph. D.
Park School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Eugene R. Smith
Passaic High School.....	Passaic, N. J.....	Arthur D. Arnold
Paterson High School.....	Paterson, N. J.....	Francis R. North
Peddle Institute.....	Hightstown, N. J.....	Roger W. Swetland
Penn Hall School for Girls.....	Chambersburg, Pa.....	F. T. Magill
Pennington School for Boys.....	Pennington, N. J.....	F. H. Green
Pennsylvania State College.....	State College, Pa.....	E. E. Sparks, Ph. D.
Perkiomen Seminary.....	Pennsburg, Pa.....	Rev. O. S. Kriebel
Phila. Normal School for Girls..	Philadelphia, Pa.....	J. Eugene Baker
Pingry School.....	Elizabeth, N. J.....	C. Mitchell Froelicher

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Polytechnic Prep. Country Day School.....	Dyker Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.....	J. D. Allen
Princeton High School.....	Princeton, N. J.....	M. T. Vanderbilt (Miss)
Princeton Preparatory School.....	Princeton, N. J.....	J. B. Fine
Princeton University.....	Princeton, N. J.....	John G. Hibben, Ph. D.
Roger Ascham School.....	White Plains, N. Y....	Mrs. Joseph Allen
Ridgefield Park High School.....	Ridgefield Park, N. J..	A. Ray Palmer
Rutgers College.....	New Brunswick, N. J..	W. H. S. Demarest, D. D.
Rutgers Preparatory School.....	New Brunswick, N. J..	William P. Kelly
St. Agatha.....	New York City (553 West End Ave.)....	Emma G. Sebring
St. Agnes' School.....	Albany, N. Y.....	Matilda Gray
St. James' School.....	Maryland.....	A. H. Onderdonk
St. John's College.....	Annapolis, Md.....	Thomas Fell, LL. D.
St. John's College, Fordham University.....	New York City.....	Rev. Edward P. Tivnan
St. John's College.....	Washington, D. C.....	Brother D. Edward
St. John's School.....	Manlius, N. Y.....	William Verbeck
St. Joseph's College.....	Philadelphia, Pa. (18th & Thompson Sts.)..	Rev. C. F. Connor, S. J.
St. Lawrence University.....	Canton, N. Y.....	Frank A. Gallop
St. Luke's School.....	Wayne, Pa.....	Charles Henry Strout
St. Mary's Hall.....	Burlington, N. J.....	Rev. John Fearnley
St. Mary's School.....	Peekskill, N. Y.....	Sister Mary Antony
St. Stephen's College.....	Annandale, N. Y.....	Rev. B. I. Bell, Ph. D.
St. Paul's School.....	Garden City, L. I.....	Walter R. Marsh
St. Thomas College.....	Scranton, Pa. (Wyoming Ave.).....	Brother Philip
Scarborough School.....	Scarborough-on-Hudson, N. Y.....	Wilford M. Aikin
Schuylkill Seminary.....	Reading, Pa.....	Warren F. Teel
Shady Side Academy.....	Pittsburgh, Pa. (5035 Castleman St.).....	H. A. Nomer
Shipley School.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	Eleanor O. Brownell
Shippen School.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	Emily R. Underhill
Sidwells Friends' School.....	Washington, D. C. (1809 I St.).....	Thomas W. Sidwell
S. Phila. High School for Girls.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Mrs. Lucy L. W. Wilson, Ph. D.
(Miss) Spence's School.....	New York City (30 W. 55th St.).....	Clara B. Spence
Springside School.....	Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.....	Mrs. L. P. Chapman
State Normal School.....	West Chester, Pa.....	Andrew T. Smith, Ph. D.
Staten Island Academy.....	New Brighton, N. Y..	Frank R. Page
Stevens Institute of Technology.....	Hoboken, N. J.....	Alexander C. Humphreys, LL. D.
Stevens School.....	Hoboken, N. J. (6th St. & Park Ave.)....	B. F. Carter
Swarthmore College.....	Swarthmore, Pa.....	Frank Aydelotte, Ph. D.
Syracuse University.....	Syracuse, N. Y.....	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S. T. D., LL. D.
Technical High School.....	Harrisburg, Pa.....	Charles B. Fager
Temple University.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Rev. R. H. Conwell
Thurston Preparatory School.....	Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Ave.).....	Alice M. Thurston
Tome School for Boys.....	Port Deposit, Md.....	Murray Brush, Ph. D.
Tower Hill School.....	Wilmington, Del.....	John D. Skilton
Trinity School.....	New York City (147 W. 91st St.).....	Rev. Lawrence T. Cole, Ph. D., D. D.
Union College.....	Schenectady, N. Y....	Charles Alexander Richmond, Ph. D.
University of Buffalo.....	Buffalo, N. Y. (Niagara Square).....	

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
University of Maryland.....	Baltimore, Md.....	A. F. Woods
University of Pennsylvania.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Josiah H. Penniman, Ph. D.
University of Pittsburgh.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.(Grant Boulevard).....	Samuel Black McCormick, D. D., LL. D.
University of Rochester.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	Rush Rhees, LL. D.
University of the State of New York.....	Albany, N. Y.....	Frank P. Graves, Ph. D.
Ursinus College.....	Collegeville, Pa.....	George L. Omwake, Ph. D.
Vail-Deane School.....	Elizabeth, N. J.....	Laura A. Vail
Vassar College.....	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.....	Henry Noble MacCracken, Ph. D., LL. D.
Wadleigh High School.....	New York City (114th St. & 7th Ave.....	Stuart H. Rowe
Washington and Jefferson College.....	Washington, Pa.....	Frederick W. Hinitt, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D.
Washington College.....	Chestertown, Md.....	James W. Cain, LL. D.
Wells College.....	Aurora-on-Cayuga, N. Y.....	Kerr D. MacMillan, Ph. D.
West Chester High School.....	West Chester, Pa.....	R. W. Reckard
Western High School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	David E. Weglein
Western High School.....	Washington, D. C.....	Elmer S. Newton
Western Maryland College.....	Westminster, Md.....	Rev. A. N. Ward
West High School.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	William M. Bennett
Westminster College.....	New Wilmington, Pa.....	Dr. W. Chas. Wallace
West Orange High School.....	West Orange, N. J.....	S. C. Strong
West Philadelphia High School for Boys.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	C. C. Heyl
West Philadelphia High School for Girls.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Parke Schoch
Westtown School.....	Westtown, Pa.....	George L. Jones
Wilkes-Barre High School.....	Wilkes-Barre, Pa.....	J. P. Breidinger
William Penn Charter School...	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Richard M. Gummere, Ph. D.
William Penn High School for Girls.....	Philadelphia, Pa. (15th & Wallace Sts.).....	William F. Grey
Wilmington High School.....	Wilmington, Del.....	A. H. Berlin
Wilson College.....	Chambersburg, Pa.....	Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL. D.
Women's College of Delaware...	Newark, Del.....	Winifred J. Robinson
Xavier High School.....	New York City (30 W. 16th St.).....	Rev. Thomas White, S. J.
Yeates School.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	John H. Schwacke
York Collegiate Institute.....	York, Pa.....	Charles H. Ehrenfeld
Miss Ella Gordon Stuart.....	Germantown, Phila. (155 W. Walnut La.)	

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1921.

ACADEMY OF THE NEW CHURCH, *Bryn Athyn, Pa.* Enoch S. Price.

ALBANY ACADEMY, *Albany, N. Y.* Islay F. McCormick, Head Master.

ALBRIGHT COLLEGE, *Myerstown, Pa.* A. E. Gobble, L. Clarence Hunt, President.

ALFRED UNIVERSITY, *Alfred, N. Y.* Boothe C. Davis, President.

BALDWIN SCHOOL, *Bryn Mawr, Pa.* Grace S. Barker, Caroline S. Bennet, Martha G. Boyer, Hazeltene L. Sledman, Esther C. M. Steele, Elizabeth W. Towle.

BARRINGER HIGH SCHOOL, *Newark, N. J.* Franklin Crosse.

BENNETT SCHOOL OF LIBERAL AND APPLIED ARTS, *Millbrook, N. Y.* Courtney Carroll.

BERNARDS TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL, *Bernardsville, N. J.* Albert C. Metts, Principal.

BETHLEHEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Bethlehem, Pa.* J. M. Tuggey, Head Master.

BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL, *Birmingham, Pa.* Preston S. Moulton, Head Master.

BORDENTOWN MILITARY INSTITUTE, *Bordentown, N. J.* George W. Low, Head Master.

BYRN MAWR MODEL SCHOOL, *Bryn Mawr, Pa.* Alice R. Parker.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, *Lewisburg, Pa.* F. G. Ballentine.

CAMDEN HIGH SCHOOL, *Camden, N. J.* Viola M. Blaisdell, Minnie G. Eckels.

CANISIUS COLLEGE, *Buffalo, N. Y.* Miles J. O'Mailia, Dean.

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, *Pittsburgh, Pa.* Thomas S. Baker.

CENTENARY COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, *Hackettstown, N. J.* Edna A. Bright, Emily Dixon.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Harold W. Brecht, J. T. Chestnut, F. A. Child, John L. Haney, President; Arthur W. Howes, Robert W. Kunzig, Albert J. May, J. H. Moffatt, Warren D. Renninger, J. Barr Stauffer, Milton B. Wise.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Mildred Dean.

CHESTER HIGH SCHOOL, *Chester, Pa.* Evelina D. Caldwell.

CHESTNUT HILL ACADEMY, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Louis Clerici, J. L. Patterson, Head Master.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, *N. Y.* Livingston R. Schuyler.

COLUMBIA HIGH SCHOOL, *South Orange, N. J.* John H. Bosshart, Principal.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York City, N. Y.* H. M. Ayres, Anna Woods Ballard, H. E. Hawkes, Adam Leroy Jones, Benj. B. Kendrick, Charles Knapp.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, *Ithaca, N. Y.* R. H. Jordan, R. H. Kemston.

66 *Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools*

DELAWARE UNIVERSITY, *Newark, Del.* Mary A. Ospina.
 DICKINSON COLLEGE, *Carlisle, Pa.* Mervin G. Filler, Dean.
 MRS. DOW'S SCHOOL, *Briarcliff Manor, N. Y.* Mrs. Ruth W. Campbell, Mrs. Edith C. Hartman, Principal.
 DREW SEMINARY FOR YOUNG WOMEN, *Carmel, N. Y.* Clarence P. McClelland, President.

EAST HIGH SCHOOL, *Rochester, N. Y.* William Bitz.
 EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Ada B. Norment.
 EAST OGDEN HIGH SCHOOL, *East Orange, N. J.* Ralph E. Files, Principal.
 ELIZABETH COLLEGE, *Elizabethtown, Pa.* F. J. Byer, L. W. Leiter.
 ELY SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Greenwich, Conn.* Elizabeth L. Ely, Principal.
 EPISCOPAL ACADEMY, *Overbrook, Pa.* Robert Andersen.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, *Fordham, N. Y.* William S. Dolan.
 FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, *Lancaster, Pa.* Henry H. Apple, President; Horace R. Barnes, Jefferson E. Kershner, Howard R. Omwake, Dean.
 FRIENDS' CENTRAL SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* J. Albert Blackburn, Lyda M. Degener, Anna B. Eisenbower, Abigail Evans, Miss A. Fussell.
 FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Guy W. Chipman, Principal.
 FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Alberta Wilson.
 FRIENDS' SELECT SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Caroline E. De Greene, Ruth S. Goodman, Walter W. Haviland, Principal; Mary A. Jones, E. Mae Myers, L. Cheyney Smith, Henry A. Todd.
 FRIENDS' SEMINARY, 226 East 16th Street, *New York, N. Y.* John L. Carver, Principal; Alice S. Palmer.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE, *Washington, D. C.* Herbert E. Day, Charles R. Ely.
 GENEVA COLLEGE, *Beaver Falls, Pa.* Robert Clarke.
 GEORGE SCHOOL, *George School, Pa.* Lena C. Clark, William Eves, Walter H. Mohr, Anne Russell, Norman W. Swayne, Paul W. Wagner, George A. Walton, Principal; Edith W. Winder.
 GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* Hugh McCarrow, W. Coleman Nevils, Dean.
 GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* DeWitt C. Croissant, Henry G. Doyle, Geo. N. Henning, Dean; H. L. Hodgkins, President; W. C. Ruediger, Dean.
 GERMANTOWN ACADEMY, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Samuel E. Osbourn, Head Master.
 GERMANTOWN FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* D. L. Burgess, Jane S. Jones, Irvin C. Poley, Emma D. Roberts, Hildegard B. Shumway, Agnes L. Tierney, Stanley R. Yarnall, Principal.
 GERMANTOWN HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Alice C. Adamson, Emily R. Ebling, Anna M. Heller, Mary S. Holmes, Elmer A. Jacoby, Frederick W. Ohl, Geo. W. Plummer, Alma T. Waldie.

GETTYSBURG COLLEGE, *Gettysburg, Pa.* W. A. Granville, President.
GIRARD COLLEGE, *Philadelphia, Pa.* D. M. Melchior.
GOUCHER COLLEGE, *Baltimore, Md.* Harry T. Baker, Katharine J. Gallagher,
W. W. Guth, President; Ernest P. Kuhl, Carrie M. Probst.
GROVE CITY COLLEGE, *Grove City, Pa.* Weir C. Ketler, President.
GUNSTON HALL SCHOOL, 1906 *Florida Avenue, Washington, D. C.* Mary
B. Kerr.

HALSTED SCHOOL, *Yonkers, N. Y.* Mary S. Jenkins, Principal.
HAMILTON COLLEGE, *Clinton, N. Y.* Frederick C. Ferry, President.
HAVERFORD SCHOOL, *Haverford, Pa.* Samuel H. Newhall, Heman S. Shaw,
A. C. Tyler, Lester D. Tyler, Edwin M. Wilson, Head Master.
HIGHLAND HALL, *Holidaysburg, Pa.* Marion Hellyar, Ethel A. Strohm.
(MISS) HILL'S SCHOOL, 1808 *Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.* Agnes B.
Austin, Principal; Lilian C. Jones, Principal; S. Frances Van Kirk.
HOBART COLLEGE, *Geneva, N. Y.* W. P. Durfee, Dean.
HOLTON-ARMS SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Fredericka Hodder, Ethel Ron-
aldsen.
HOOD COLLEGE, *Frederick, Md.* Joseph H. Apple, President; W. Augusta
Lantz, Esther E. Shaw.
HORACE MANN SCHOOL FOR BOYS, *New York City.* A. F. Pirnig, Robert
McCormick, Charles C. Tillinghast, Principal; John T. Van Sant.
HOWARD UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* J. Stanley Durkee, President.
HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK. George S. Davis, President;
Edgar Dawson, Claudine Gray, Laura Guggenbuhl, Dorothea C. Hess,
Lewis D. Hill, Martha N. Kennerly, Helen L. Kunte, Evangeline A.
Moon, Lao G. Simons, Evelyn Walker.
JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, *Baltimore, Md.* William J. A. Bliss, John C.
French, John H. Latané, Dean.

JUNIATA COLLEGE, *Huntingdon, Pa.* E. C. Wagner.

KENSINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Anna Adaire, M. Roberta
Bischoff, Thyra Crawford, Beulah A. Fenimore, Principal; Elizabeth
N. Frorer, Marie L. Kiefer, Harriet J. Link, Harriet Plimpton, Miss M.
A. Purdy, Eleanor M. Regan, Luella Sexamith, Harriet W. Sheppard,
Anita P. Shollenberger, Elmira Sodor, Anna B. Thorne

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, *Easton, Pa.* Henry V. Shelley.
LA SALLE COLLEGE, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Brother Richard, President.
LA SALLE INSTITUTE, *Cumberland, Md.* Brother Felician, Principal.
LAWRENCEVILLE SCHOOL, *Lawrenceville, N. J.* C. H. Breed.
LEBANON VALLEY COLLEGE, *Annville, Pa.* Samuel H. Derickson, G. G.
Gossard, President; Samuel O. Grimm.
LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Henry S. Drinker, President Emeri-
tus; N. M. Emery, John L. Stewart, C. L. Thornburg.

68 *Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools*

- LINCOLN SCHOOL OF TEACHERS' COLLEGE, *New York City*. J. R. Clark.
 LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, *Lincoln University, Pa.* George Johnson, Dean; Wm. Hallock Johnson, Dean; W. L. Wright.
- MAHER PREPARATORY AND TUTORING SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* John F. Maher, Head Master.
 MAPLEWOOD SCHOOL FOR BOYS, *Harling, Del. Co., Pa.* J. Chauncey Shortlidge, Principal.
 MARY LYON SCHOOL, *Swarthmore, Pa.* Mrs. H. M. Crist, Principal; Mr. H. M. Crist, Principal; Lilian Dixon, Alice W. Jackson, Grace B. Falck.
 MASSEE SCHOOL, *Stamford, Conn.* W. W. Massee.
 MEDIA FRIENDS' SELECT SCHOOL, *Media, Pa.* Anna B. Smedley, Principal.
 MERCERSBURG ACADEMY, *Mercersburg, Pa.* Wilmarth I. Jacobs, James G. Miller.
 MOORESTOWN HIGH SCHOOL, *Moorestown, N. J.* Mary Nunez.
 MOORESTOWN FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Moorestown, N. J.* W. E. Barrett, Head Master; Ruby Davis, Martha C. H. Swan.
 MORAVIAN COLLEGE, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Albert G. Rau, Dean.
 MUHLENBERG COLLEGE, *Allentown, Pa.* Robert C. Horn.
- NEWARK ACADEMY, *Newark, N. J.* Wilson Farrand, Head Master, Louis A. Roux.
 NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, *New York City*. Homer A. Watt, Hugo C. M. Wendell.
 NORTHEAST HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* George D. Fronin, Theo. S. Rowland, Ellis A. Schnabel, Geo. F. Stradling, Principal; James G. Sigman.
- PACKER COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* John H. Denbigh, Principal.
 PENN HALL SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Chambersburg, Pa.* Mary R. Botsford, Helen Hoffa.
 PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE, *State College, Pa.* William D. Crockett.
 PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN, *Pittsburgh, Pa.* John C. Acheson, President.
 PERKIOMEN SCHOOL, *Pennsburg, Pa.* Paul H. Hartman.
 PEDDIE INSTITUTE, *Hightstown, N. J.* R. W. Swetland, Head Master.
 PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Helen C. Bailey, Mary A. Boyle, Emma H. Carroll, Lewis R. Harley, Principal; Alice M. Holbrook, Ida A. Keller, Margaret Sproul, Eleanor W. Thompson, Carolyn A. Underhill, Nettie Wurster, Evaline Young.
 PHILADELPHIA NORMAL SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* J. Eugene Baker, Principal; Eleanor S. Lungren, Pauline W. Spencer, Grace E. Spiegle.
 POLYTECHNIC PREPARATORY COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL, *Dyker Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.* C. P. Scoboria.
 PRINCETON HIGH SCHOOL, *Princeton, N. J.* Miles G. Thompson, Principal.
 PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, *Princeton, N. J.* Douglas L. Buffum, Morris W. Croll, Howard McClenahan, Dean.

- RANDOLPH-MACON COLLEGE, *Ashland, Va.* R. E. Blackwell, President.
- RUTGERS COLLEGE, *New Brunswick, N. J.* Edward B. Davis, Charles H. Elliott, Harold B. Stanton.
- RUTGERS PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *New Brunswick, N. J.* William P. Kelly, Head Master; John Tallmadge.
- ST. FRANCIS XAVIER HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Louis J. Gallagher.
- ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, *Washington, D. C.* Brother D. Edward, President.
- ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, *Annapolis, Md.* R. H. Ridgely.
- ST. JOHN'S SCHOOL, *Manlius, N. Y.* Brewster B. Moore, Head Master.
- ST. LUKE'S SCHOOL, *Wayne, Pa.* Jesse E. Philips.
- ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL, *Garden City, N. Y.* Walter R. Marsh, Head Master.
- ST. THOMAS COLLEGE, *Scranton, Pa.* Brother F. Edward.
- SCARBOROUGH SCHOOL, *Scarborough-on-Hudson, N. Y.* W. M. Aikin, Director.
- SCARSDALE HIGH SCHOOL, *Scarsdale, N. Y.* Grace E. Barber.
- SCHUYLKILL SEMINARY, *Reading, Pa.* W. F. Tell, President.
- SIDWELL'S FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Mrs. Thomas W. Sidwell, Thomas W. Sidwell, Principal.
- SOUTH PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Julia M. Bligh, Laura H. Cadwallader, Amy L. Clapp, Margaret Groff, Anna C. Kaufmann, M. Louise Nichols, Helen O. Shollenberger.
- STATE NORMAL SCHOOL, *West Chester, Pa.* S. C. Schmucker, Wallace P. Dick.
- STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, *Hoboken, N. J.* F. L. Sevenook.
- SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY, *Susquehanna, Pa.* Chas. T. Aikens, President.
- SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, *Swarthmore, Pa.* Frank Aydelotte, President; Esther E. Baldwin, Ethel H. Brenster, Dean; Isabelle Bronk, H. Jermain Creighton, Philip M. Hicks, Jesse H. Holmes, Allen Myers, Clara P. Newport, W. Carson Ryan, Raymond Walters, Dean; Winthrop R. Wright.
- TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, *Philadelphia, Pa.* H. C. Biddle, James H. Dunham, Dean; Isabel Graves, Fineman Hayim, Marion Mackenzie, Frederick L. Nussbaum.
- TOME SCHOOL, *Port Deposit, Md.* C. A. Ewing, Frederick S. Henry.
- TOWER HILL SCHOOL, *Wilmington, Delaware.* John Davis Skilton, Head Master.
- UNION COLLEGE, *Schenectady, N. Y.* Edward E. Hale.
- UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE, *Newark, Del.* Quaesita C. Drake, Walter Hullihen, President; Winifred J. Robinson, Dean; Edward L. Smith, Dean; W. O. Sypherd.
- UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, *Baltimore, Md.* C. O. Appleman, Dean; Neil E. Gordon, W. M. Hillegeist, Homer C. House, Thomas H. Spence, Dean; T. B. Thompson.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Herman V. Ames, Dean; J. B. Beck, Geo. Gailey Chambers, J. P. W. Crawford, George D. Hadzits, George Wm. McClelland, C. E. McClung, Walton B. McDaniel, Josiah H. Penniman, Provost; Arthur H. Quinn, Dean; J. C. Rolfe, D. B. Shumway.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, *Pittsburgh, Pa.* Jno. C. Fetterman, Dean; J. Steele Gow, S. B. Linhart.

UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, *Albany, N. Y.* Augustus S. Downing.

UPPER DARBY HIGH SCHOOL, *Upper Darby, Pa.* E. Lucile Noble.

URSINUS COLLEGE, *Collegeville, Pa.* Wm. R. Gawthrop, W. A. Kline, Dean; Paul A. Mertz, George L. Omwake, President; Leo. F. Small.

VAIL-DEANE SCHOOL, *Elizabeth, N. J.* Adelaide J. Howell, Laura A. Vail, Principal.

WALNUT LANE SCHOOL, *Germantown, Pa.* Helen S. Loveland.

WARSAW HIGH SCHOOL, *Warsaw, N. Y.* Julia M. Bligh.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE, *Chestertown, Md.* A. S. Hall, J. S. William Jones.

WASHINGTON IRVING HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City, N. Y.* Rosemary F. Mullen.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE, *Washington, Pa.* R. B. English, Dean.

WELLS COLLEGE, *Aurora-on-Cayuga, N. Y.* Kerr D. MacMillen, President.

WEST CHESTER HIGH SCHOOL, *West Chester, Pa.* Grace Cochran, B. Reed Henderson, Elizabeth M. House, Edith M. Jackson, Stanley R. Oldham, Julia L. Swadener.

WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Miriam Elfreth, Mary H. Mullikin.

WESTERN MARYLAND COLLEGE, *Westminster, Md.* A. M. Isanogle, A. N. Ward, President.

WEST ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL, *West Orange, N. J.* Frederick W. Reimherr, Principal.

WEST PHILADELPHIA BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* John T. Brackin, J. Alexander Clarke, Harvey B. Danehower, W. S. Eldridge, William I. Jones, Donald L. McDonough, Geo. Lewis Plitt, Wm. E. Roberts, L. F. Rondinella, Edward W. Thilo.

WEST PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Gertrude Bricker, Mary C. Burchinal, Nellie P. Ferry, Myra O. Godfrey, Hannah Gordman, Emma M. Haigh, Anna M. Kinney, Emma G. Kunze, Annie Linton, Elizabeth Linton, Elizabeth P. Longaker, R. Beatrice Miller, Esther M. Reinhardt, Parke Schoch, Principal; M. Eloise Schuyler, Harriet M. True, Dena D. Ungemach, Grace M. Worcester.

WESTTOWN SCHOOL, *Westtown, Pa.* Samuel H. Brown, Edith M. Cook.

WHITE HIGH SCHOOLS, *Washington, D. C.* Harry English, Rene Samson.

WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Henry A. Dresser, Everett S. Kelson.

- WILLIAM PENN HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Elizabeth Bayer, Amanda C. Beitler, Bertha M. Clark, Annie Dunster, Margaret C. Eaton, Rebecca P. Elliott, Helen Hill, Agnes H. Long, Bertha J. Mueller, Jonathan T. Rorer, Helen B. Shriver, W. W. Stewart, Catharine E. Way.
- WILMINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Wilmington, Del* Frances L. Baird, Helen Coleman, Charles Coxe, Principal; Anna E. Downward, Ralph Jacobs, Esau H. Loomis, Henry M. Snyder.
- WILMINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Wilmington, Pa.* Carrie B. Kilgore.
- WILSON COLLEGE, *Chambersburg, Pa.* Charlotte I. Davison, Lillian M. Rosenkrans, Dean; E. D. Warfield, President.
- WOODBURY HIGH SCHOOL, *Woodbury, N. J.* Emily E. Hallauer.
- YEATES SCHOOL, *Lancaster, Pa.* George St. John Rathbun, Head Master.
- FRIENDS' YEARLY MEETING SCHOOLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Mrs. Ida P. Stabler.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, *New York State.* J. Cayce Morrison.
- DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, *Pennsylvania.* J. George Becht, G. C. L. Riemer.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, *Delaware County, Media, Pa.* A. G. Criswell Smith.
- GINN AND COMPANY. Roland L. Eaton, Ralph Hayes.
- BRYANT TEACHERS' BUREAU, 610 *Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.* Myrton A. Bryant.
- MACMILLAN COMPANY, *New York.* J. Franklin Brown.
- SCOTT, FOREMAN & Co. Charles E. Keck.
- AMERICAN BOOK Co., *N. Y. C.* John J. Greer.
- JOHN C. WINSTON Co., *Philadelphia, Pa.* Geo. A. Sigman.
- EDUCATIONAL EDITOR, *Public Ledger.* Eric Sanville.
- ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES. R. E. Blackwell, Randolph-Macon College.

